DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 100 CS 200 283

AUTHOR	Kegler, Stanley B., Ed.
TITLE	The Changing Role of English Education: Selected Addresses Delivered at the Conference on English Education (2nd, University of Illinois, April 2-4, 1964).
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
PUB DATE	65
NOTE	100p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801 (Stock No. 17207, $1.65 non-member, $1.50 member)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Composition (Literary); Curriculum Development; *English Curriculum; *English Education; Inquiry Training; Language; Language Teachers; Literary Analysis; Literature; Professional Education; Secondary School Teachers; Student Teachers; Teacher Background; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Educators; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

The 11 addresses comprising this monograph indicate the proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on English Education. Included are Dwight L. Burton's definitions of English education as a scholarly discipline; Richard Corbin's discussion of the NCTE report "Research in Written Composition"; Dorothy Pettit's thesis that organic unity is the primary concept to be taught in literature; James M. McCrimmon's survey of language concepts to be taught to prospective English teachers; Morris Finder's idea that the prospective teacher must master methods of inquiry appropriate to literature, language, and composition; George H. Henry's discussion of the general and professional education of the English teacher; Donald K. Smith's call for a "sequence-of-knowledge" English curriculum for secondary schools; Alfred H. Grommon's report on volume V of the "NCTE Curriculum Series"--"The Education of Teachers of English"; James R. Squire's views of present programs and innovations in the education of English teachers; and reports on the Wisconsin and Florida English curriculum development projects. Summaries of group discussions are also provided. (This document previously announced as ED 023 683.) (JB)

ED 070100

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CHANGING ROLE OF ENGLISH EDUCATION:

Selected Addresses Delivered at the SECOND CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION.

University of Illinois
April 2-4, 1964

STANLEY B. KEGLER
Editor

National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois

Copyright 1965

National Council of Teachers of English

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

National Council of Teachers of English

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

National Council of Teachers of English
CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION
University of Illinois, April 2-4, 1964

Program Chairman: STANLEY B. KEGLER, University of Minnesota

Local Cochairmen: WILLIAM H. EVANS, University of Illinois
JAMES R. SQUIRE, University of Illinois

Planning Committee Members:

GEORGE HENRY, University of Delaware
J. N. HOOK, University of Illinois
GRACE KRATZ KNAGGS, Thomas A. DeVilbiss High School, Toledo, Ohio
DORA V. SMITH, Minneapolis, Minnesota
INGRID STROM, Indiana University
DAVID STRYKER, University of Florida
SISTER MARY SYLVIA, S.S.J., Mount St. Joseph Teachers College

3

Consultant Readers

ARNOLD LAZARUS, Director, Teacher Education in English
Purdue University
Director, Project English at Purdue

RUTH G. STRICKLAND, Professor of Education
Indiana University

NCTE Committee on Publications

JAMES R. SQUIRE, NCTE Executive Secretary, *chairman*
JARVIS E. BUSH, Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh
GLENN LEGGETT, University of Washington
VIRGINIA M. REID, Oakland, California, Public Schools
ENID M. OLSON, NCTE Director of Publications

INTRODUCTION

When the Conference on English Education first met in Bloomington, many of us wondered if this might well be the first and last meeting of those interested in English education. We knew that we were not a large group nationally; many of us were departments in ourselves. Unfortunately, many of us were able to give only a small part of our time to the work of English education. Little wonder, then, that there was concern in many minds about the kind of response which would be accorded that first conference. We need not have worried, however, for one of the main recommendations of the Bloomington conference was that we should meet again and should try to form a permanent organization.

In setting out to formulate the program for the Second Annual Conference at Champaign, the planning committee decided to follow essentially the same pattern of general sessions and discussion groups. In looking about for the people who could most readily deliver papers of general interest to our profession, the planning committee, with the aid of participants' suggestions from the previous year, decided to ask Dwight L. Burton to deliver the keynote address which appears as the first article in this monograph. It was relatively easy, too, to decide on a speaker for the closing session since we knew that James R. Squire was interested in applications of the "new" English in teacher preparation programs. With all of the interest in the teaching of language concepts, we decided quite early to ask Donald K. Smith to examine for us some of the implications of present day interest in the teaching of language and the principles of rhetoric.

To accompany these three major addresses, we asked other speakers to develop papers on special topics, some of which were delivered to general sessions and some of which were delivered to discussion groups, meeting singly or in joint sessions. In a sense, these were to be the "frosting on the cake," but in retrospect it has become quite difficult to distinguish between the frosting and the cake.

The participants in the Bloomington conference had readily agreed that some attempt should be made to develop a proposal which would lead to the formation of a continuing Conference on English Education. The participants at the Champaign conference adopted the recommendation for a continuing conference, with the stipulation that this group, organized within the National Council of Teachers of English, should meet annually. An executive committee was duly elected, and plans were formulated for dealing with problems as they affect this group.

This monograph, then, is a summary of the proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on English Education held at Champaign, but even the most fleeting reading of the articles contained here will reveal that the speeches and summaries of discussion are not as much a statement of the past as they are observations about the future. None of these points of view needs to be

regarded as a "blueprint"; rather, these articles *in toto* represent the present status of "The Changing Role of English Education."

STANLEY B. KEGLER
Minneapolis, Minnesota
October, 1964

CONTENTS

Introduction v
Stanley B. Kegler (including organizational remarks)

English Education as Scholarly Discipline 1
Dwight L. Burton

Implications of *Research in Written Composition* 16
Richard Corbin

Two Projects in Curriculum Development:

The Wisconsin Project 19
Robert C. Pooley, Leonard V. Kosinski, John R. Searles

The Florida Project 22
John S. Simmons

Concepts to Be Taught:

Organic Form: The Primary Concept to Be Taught in Literature . 26
Dorothy Petitt

What Language Concepts Should We Teach to Future Teachers of English? 35
James M. McCrimmon

Methods of Inquiry 42
Morris Finder

A Way of Preparing an English Teacher 51
George H. Henry

English, Speech, and Language Arts: Disorder and Latter Day Sorrow . 61
Donald K. Smith

A Report on Volume V: *The Education of Teachers of English* 71
Alfred H. Grommon

Does the New English Demand a New English Education? 76
James R. Squire

Summaries of Group Discussions 87

Program 91

ENGLISH EDUCATION AS SCHOLARLY DISCIPLINE

Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University

I am flattered to be labeled the keynote speaker at this opening session of our conference, but I am a bit awed, too, for one feels the greatest challenge when he speaks before his friends. I hope, actually, that I may not be speaking as much to you as for you when I suggest some propositions that may constitute a raison d'etre for our gathering for the second time on a national basis. I do not have to convince most of you that English education—and that term is used now without quotation marks in the most august sources—*is* a scholarly discipline. There are signals in the wind. There is, first, the fact of this *second* national conference on English education. There is the recently published volume, *The Education of Teachers of English*, to be discussed at another of our general sessions. There is the proposal, revealing, though perhaps impracticable, made by Donald Tuttle last year at the Allerton Park Conference that the preparation of the specialist in English education require a *post* doctoral degree! There is the statement from that conference which it was my pleasure to quote at our conference last year at Indiana University:

> The teaching of English and research in teaching will profit from joint efforts of specialists in English, English education, psychology, and other areas . . . . Faculty members engaged in research in the teaching of English should be considered eligible for any reduction in teaching loads that is available for those engaged in literary or linguistic research, and the results should be evaluated by criteria comparable to those applied in literary or linguistic disciplines.[1]

English education as scholarly discipline has been long in arriving, but it has arrived. Its arrival owes much to the groundwork laid by Dora V. Smith, Lou LaBrant, Helene Hartley, Robert C. Pooley, J. N. Hook, Lennox Grey, John DeBoer, and others. Its arrival owes, too, to the idea that English as general education at the elementary, high school, and early college levels is different in kind, not only in degree, from English as special discipline in upper college years and the graduate school.

For those of us who have been in English education for some time, the road academically *has* seemed long and tortuous, perhaps, but the broad view may make the progress of English education seem almost dramatic. Think of the transition from the barbershop status of English education only a short time ago. The conception undergirding the barbershop approach was that anyone who managed to survive the hurly-burly of the public school classroom was capable of teaching prospective teachers, just as any competent barber can teach someone else to cut hair. So Sarah Jones who had been teaching in the local schools for ten years without incidence of pregnancy, marriage, or other assaults on celibacy or decency was called on to whip out a methods course.

---

[1] Richard Wasson (ed)., *Proceedings of the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English*, December 2-4, 1962 (Urbana: Department of English, University of Illinois, 1963), p. 118.

A few years later, English education meant the appointment of a supervisor of student teachers, who bird-dogged his charges into the hinterlands and was, perhaps, entrusted to the teaching of an undergraduate "methods" course but nothing else. The transition then led to recognition as a second-rate member of an English or education department whose chief duty it was to stand as a buffer between his more respectable and sensitive colleagues and the administrators and other unpleasant realities of the public schools.

Then came the liaison men, often holding appointments, but not much status, in both departments of English and education, whose major duty was to patrol that dismal no-man's-land between the academicians and the educationists, an ambassador without portfolio and usually without promotion. Finally came legitimate joint appointments in English and in education or the status, perhaps, in one or the other. And more recently, even, has come the establishment of departments of English education.

If I speak caustically, it is out of gratitude. And if I exaggerate, it is out of fatuous concern for this as the opening statement.

You recall that several times last year we mentioned that now almost famous question that came from the Basic Issues Conference of 1958, "What the hell *is* English education?" And we might echo, in words more acceptable to the Southern Baptist conscience, "What *is* the nature of the discipline? What does the scholar in the field know?"

He is not just someone in education who happens to know something about English, nor is he someone in English who happens to know something about and have some interest in what goes on in the English classrooms of the public schools. The definition of the discipline may be based, first, on what the scholar of English education is generally expected to do or what he will be expected to do when he completes preparation. Last year, Dr. Pooley's excellent opening address at this conference dealt with the professional and scholarly responsibilities of the specialist in English education. The definition is based, secondly, on the nature of the few excellent programs for educating scholars in our field which have existed for some time or which are being developed or proposed in a number of universities. I suggest that the demanding discipline of English education encompasses six facets: (1) English linguistics, (2) rhetoric, (3) literature, (4) research technique, (5) nature of learning, (6) philosophy and sociology of American education. I am not so naive as to suppose that our scholarship in any one of these facets will necessarily equal in depth that of the person who limits his work to that facet, and whose help we may need frequently in our work. But our scholarship in each should go well beyond casual acquaintance and should represent serious, formal study. It is this combination of learning that makes of English education a unique discipline and gives the scholar in the field his competence in dealing with curriculum and methodology in English. No doctoral program can provide the candidate with thorough preparation in all of these fields, but the doctorate should lay foundations in all of them and may lead to true specialization in one or more.

For the competent scholar in any discipline, completion of the doctorate is the beginning. What is done to deepen learning in the years immediately fol-

lowing is as vital as the work for the degree itself, and evidence of the deepening should be a major criterion for promotion in academic rank or professional position. In speaking of the doctorate as minimal formal preparation, I realize, at the same time, that not all competent scholars in English education will necessarily have the degree.

English Linguistics

Since I have this opportunity to play Jehovah in defining our discipline, let me be more specific about the directions of learning and the special responsibilities in each of the six areas I have identified. Scholars in English education have been active in linguistic research and in upgrading the quality of English language learning in the schools. Priscilla Tyler, Lou LaBrant, Stanley Kegler, Ruth Strickland, Walter Loban are names that come immediately to mind. Conversely, linguists have concerned themselves with public school programs—Harold Allen, Paul Roberts, Nelson Francis, Thomas Wetmore, James Sledd, Henry Lee Smith, among others. Two college professors of English, Bertrand Evans and James Sledd, arguing on different sides of the many-sided grammar issue a few years ago, referred in different tones to the alliance between linguists (one called them "linguisticists") and educationists. There *has* been such an alliance, to the profit of the profession.

We have heard eloquent statements on the desirability of and need for a "language-centered" curriculum in English. As a group we have worked for a better balance between language and literature in the undergraduate programs for prospective teachers.

It is obvious that the English education scholar should have a thorough knowledge of the three major grammars—traditional, structural, and transformational—though he may not be a proponent of any one system. Knowing the public school classroom, he will play a vital role in interpreting developments in grammar and findings from linguistic research to elementary and high school teachers in this time of transition in teaching about the English language.

Reasonable competence in English linguistics goes further, of course, than knowledge of grammatical theory. There is a heartening increase of interest on the part of teachers at all levels in broadening the scope of language teaching, to include not only grammar, but phonology, history of the language, regional linguistics and dialects, lexicography. Exciting materials for language teaching are being prepared at the Curriculum Study Centers in English at the University of Nebraska and the University of Minnesota.

We are aware, of course, of some tendency to go overboard in the teaching of linguistics. We know of those schools which propose to teach junior and senior high school students more linguistics than the average Ph.D. in English learns—though the average Ph.D. should learn more than he does. And we are aware that linguistic dilettantism in some schools represents sheer frittering away of time. It should be a particular competence of the English education scholar to help teachers select appropriate linguistic materials for various school levels. The exciting and helpful new resource published by the NCTE, *Dialects—USA*,

for example, needs interpretation to teachers, as Annabel Ashley, one of the authors, does in an article in the April, 1964, *English Journal*.[2]

The relation of linguistic scholarship to the teaching of reading is an active field, sometimes battlefield, at present. To an extent, at least, it may be necessary for the English education scholar to act as mediator, or interpreter again, between linguistics and the teaching of reading. Though I have become convinced, in my own dyspeptic way, that there is more charlatanry per capita among specialists in reading than among most other educational groups, with the exception of people in general curriculum and in guidance and counseling, reading specialists *have* rightly reminded us both of the potential contributions and limitations of the linguists in approaching the teaching of reading. But a linguist, Raven McDavid, perhaps has covered the situation most succinctly when he says that the role of the linguist in the teaching of reading is threefold: (1) to analyze the language scientifically with particular attention to the simple constituent elements; (2) to analyze in similar fashion the writing system by which the language is represented; (3) to determine the degree of fit between the two systems and to discover patterns of correlation between them that may facilitate the teaching of reading. But McDavid goes on to say that there are some important matters with which the linguist is *not* competent to deal: (1) the nature of the learning process itself; (2) the mechanical-physical problems of muscular movements and eye spans; (3) the learning load in terms of the number and distinctiveness of discrete symbols to be presented at one time; (4) the sequence in which parts of the graphic system are introduced as representative of the sound system; (5) the problem of reading readiness; (6) the sociological pressures that encourage or discourage reading.[3]

Of course, nothing under our academic rubrics make it impossible for one to be competent linguist and competent reading specialist at the same time.

Broad knowledge, then, is the key to competence in English linguistics for the scholar in English education. This necessary breadth of view of English language study is well put by Priscilla Tyler as she suggests that we "teach language not only as the mechanistic invention of man but as the conserver and mirror of culture. Language not only represents the meaning which a society or individual discovers in terms of verbal signals but is a memory device by which the meanings men have discovered and accumulated in words are kept as in a storehouse. Names for daily chores and household equipment as well as the images by which men live are all stored in the speech of a region or the writing of a period. Language is the tapestry of culture representing the people who use it and have made it. The substance of language is subject to the same kinds of classification as any other kind of cultural artifact. We can organize

[2] Annabel Ashley, "Using *Dialects—USA* in High School Classes," *English Journal*, LIII (April, 1964), 256–265.

[3] Raven I. McDavid, Jr., "The Role of the Linguist in the Teaching of Reading," *Changing Concepts of Reading Instruction*, ed. J. Allen Figurel. *International Reading Association Conference Proceedings*, 6 (1961), 254.

language by time, place, and nationality in the way we do other kinds of human behavior."[4]

Rhetoric

Though aspects of linguistics represent legitimate fields of study in themselves at any educational level, the bridging between linguistics and rhetoric is going forward. Professor Verna Newsome demonstrates in the May, 1964, issue of the *English Journal*, for example, how sentence expansions and transformations relate to improvement of style in writing.[5] Probably few of us in English education have had opportunity for formal study of modern rhetoric; indeed, the lack of a satisfactory modern theory of discourse has been cited frequently.[6]

Plainly more training in rhetoric will be necessary for prospective specialists in English education. For rhetoric is enjoying a renaissance, though some of our colleagues in speech will maintain that there never was a decline. We hear often, though, the term "the new rhetoric" from scholars of both English and speech, and a study by Father Daniel Fogarty, carried out under the direction of Francis Shoemaker, resulted in the brilliant book, *Roots for a New Rhetoric*.[7]

Drawing on psychology, sociology, and linguistics, the new rhetoric has two basic emphases, Professor Karl Wallace points out: (1) the subject matter of discourse, including practical discourse, the ends of which are understanding and persuasion; (2) the ethical problems and responsibilities of the speaker or writer.[8] Wayne Minnick's book, *The Art of Persuasion*, presents a succinct discussion of ethical problems in persuasion, useful to teachers of both written and oral composition.[9] An impressively broad unit on persuasion for teaching in high school has been developed in the Curriculum Study Center in English at the University of Minnesota.

It is the emphasis on rhetoric in the full sense that makes a humanistic study of composition, as distinguished from mere study of style, for the roots of rhetoric are in the matters of speaker or writer, idea, audience, tone and attitude toward experience and the symbols that order it. Composition, Albert Kitzhaber says, is "an important way to order experience, to discover ideas and render them more precise, and to give them effective utterance. It is intimately related to thought itself. Considered in this light, composition is a liberal study, lying at the heart of any rounded scheme of education."[10]

A rhetoric is related naturally to a conception of life. We have the rhetoric of adolescence, with its emphasis on the rhythm of syncopation, its monolithic

---

[4] Priscilla Tyler, "New Concepts and Content for the English Curriculum," *English Leaflet*, LXI (Midwinter, 1962), 9. See also Arnold Lazarus, "A Contextual Criticism," *English Journal*, LII (December, 1963), 701 ff.

[5] Verna L. Newsome, "Expansions and Transformations to Improve Sentences," *English Journal*, LIII (May, 1964), 327–335.

[6] See, for example, Albert R. Kitzhaber, "New Perspectives on Teaching Composition," *College English*, XXIII (March, 1962), 440–444.

[7] Daniel Fogarty, *Roots for a New Rhetoric* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959).

[8] Karl Wallace, "Towards a Rationale for Teachers of Writing and Speaking," *English Journal*, L (September, 1961), 384–391.

[9] Wayne Minnick, *The Art of Persuasion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957).

[10] Kitzhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 441.

concept of audience, its often narrow choice of modifiers, representing an unawareness of choice of alternatives. Professor Walker Gibson cites the rhetoric of the Beats—the characteristic jazz cadence, and the typical modification and qualification of nouns and adjectives, suggesting that words do not express what is quite accurate, what is quite the way things are: "The uptown scene like" or "The town was like wild, man." The Beats are determinedly antiverbal, Gibson points out.[11]

In speaking of the new rhetoric, Karl Wallace maintains that "Rhetoric has a subject matter which no other discipline has or wants to claim today. It is the thought, information, and opinion revealed in the great, persisting, and unresolved problems of a civilization and culture."[12] As specialists in language, we are reminded by Wallace's words of the famous statement by Jean-Paul Sartre, "We are condemned to be free." Walker Gibson's book, *The Limits of Language*, is subtitled, "The new horizons of science and philosophy and their effect on language and literature." This suggests a concept far different from another current one which holds that all or most of the writing done in English classes be related to the study of imaginative literature.

Father Fogarty, in the study I cited earlier, makes clear that the most important newer influences on rhetoric are probably the work of the General Semanticists, led by Alfred and Irving Lee, Korzybski, Hayakawa, and Wendell Johnson; the work of I. A. Richards and his adherents; and the monumental work of Kenneth Burke. To the General Semanticist, rhetoric serves basically a therapeutic purpose; language is linked intimately and always with state of mind. Richards has been concerned with the significance of rhetoric to listener and reader as well as to speaker and writer. Burke's rhetoric is rooted in sociology and psychology. As Fogarty puts it, for Burke, "the whole range of his [man's] activity, from a man's inner, subconscious conflicts to the highest kind of conscious abstraction, is rhetoric."[13]

The revival of rhetoric in the classroom will be a boon if we do not fall into an earlier trap of assuming that formal instruction in rhetorical principles will automatically carry over into more effective writing and speaking. Yet we can see clearly that in recent years the teaching of rhetoric has sunk into an unfortunate decline in many schools, a decline epitomized in the use, as textbooks in expression, of handbooks containing a conglomeration of do's and don't's in alphabetical order. Mere practice in speaking or writing, with attention to the sheerest of practical matters, is not enough. There must be a definite structure in teaching, a subject matter which will demand greater knowledge of the process, the psychology of composition, the practices of effective writers, such as the information coming from the studies of Francis Christensen,[14] and the role emotional elements play in the formulation of logical propositions. The central aim in the teaching of rhetoric has been put succinctly, I think, by Wayne

[11] Walker Gibson, *The Limits of Language* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1962), p. 112.
[12] Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 386.
[13] Fogarty, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
[14] See, for example, Francis Christensen, "Notes Toward a New Rhetoric," *College English*, XXV (October, 1963), 7–18.

Booth: ". . . development of the rhetorical stance, a stance which depends on discovering and maintaining in any writing situation a proper balance among the three elements that are at work in any communicative effort: the available arguments about the subject itself, the interests and peculiarities of the audience, and the voice, the implied character, of the speaker." [15]

Literature

In discussing linguistics and rhetoric as facets of the discipline of English education, I have asked necessarily, it seems to me, for *more* knowledge and for *greater* responsibility on the part of the English education scholar. In literature, it is different, I think: we may not need more traditional knowledge so much as greater eclecticism and perhaps some *unique* responsibilities.

It is the particular charge of the English education scholar, I believe, to promote a broad and human approach to the study of literature. A monolithic approach in the graduate schools of the past few decades, featuring close analysis of the structure of literary selections, may have inadvertently brought some diminishing to the study of literature in the public school classroom. The formal approach has been prevalent and commands the zeal of most leading contemporary critics. Valuable as this approach is, there are others which can contribute to a fullness in experiencing literature. The need for eclecticism was stressed in the report by John Gerber on the summer institutes sponsored by the Commission on English. The literature course, the report says, "should be designed to make the participants more aware of the various approaches to the literary work (e.g., the analytical, the biographical, the sociocultural, the ideological, the generic, the comparative, the mythical, the ethical . . .) . . . the emphasis in the course should be on formal analysis." [16]

Since I have used Wilbur Scott's term, the "formal approach," I will use his terminology also in suggesting several others—the moral, psychological, sociological, and archetypal—which have especial relevance to the high school and undergraduate classroom.[17]

The term "moral approach" may produce some shudders among you, conjuring up memories of teachers who relentlessly pursue "morals" through selections or insist, with whatever twisting that is necessary to the purpose, that selections illuminate red-blooded American ideals. I recall a student teacher years ago who was reduced almost to hysteria through her efforts to match morals with each of the stories of Edgar Allan Poe. Her trouble, of course, was not that she was not successful, but rather that she was!

A narrow application of the moral approach has been rightly scorned, yet the relation of literature to values is the impactful point of contact for students

---

[15] Wayne C. Booth, "The Rhetorical Stance," *College Composition and Communication*, XIV (October, 1963), 141.

[16] John C. Gerber, *An Independent Evaluation of the 1962 Summer Institute Program of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board, with Recommendations for Future Institutes.* Cooperative Research Project No. G-004 (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1963), p. 74.

[17] Wilbur S. Scott, *Five Approaches of Literary Criticism* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1962).

studying literature at any level. In the remarkable section on "Values" in their book, *Teaching Language and Literature*, Loban, Ryan, and Squire state: "Literature cannot be taught apart from the morality of humanity. . . . To view literature as a formula for moral action is to mistake its nature and miss its rewards. However, because it can enlarge our awareness of values and refine our discrimination among values, literature is a force of tremendous potential for education." [18] No scholar of English education should miss reading, either, Louise Rosenblatt's discussion of the relation of literature and moral attitudes in her book, *Literature as Exploration*.[19]

The psychological approach to literature is still very fruitful, too, though the label may suggest an overconcern with man's libidinous compulsions (though what is more fun to be concerned with!). The application of psychological knowledge to literature can provide at least three kinds of illumination, as Wilbur Scott has pointed out.[20] First, psychology provides some insight into the creative process and the relation between writer and reader. Under this rubric is the work of I. A. Richards, for example, in analyzing the constituents of the aesthetic experience. Another part of this general field includes the application of psycholinguistics to verbal style and the literary process, an area of investigation which undoubtedly will become increasingly important. In his paper included in *Style in Language*, the proceedings of a conference held at Indiana University in 1958, John B. Carroll holds that if "we can study the 'personalities' of people by factor analysis, we should be able to study the 'personalities' of samples of prose," [21] and he demonstrates differences in the prose of Mickey Spillane and F. Scott Fitzgerald through his method. It is not fantastic that we should be able to detect, with fair certainty, what selections of literature will elicit what responses from students with given characteristics. "The right book for the right child at the right time" can then become something besides a slogan.

The study of the lives of authors as a means of understanding their art is obviously a second application of the psychological approach, and the third involves the explanations of actions of fictitious characters. Ernest Jones's famous study of Hamlet from a Freudian viewpoint provides an answer, for example, for some critics to the puzzle of Hamlet's delay in avenging his father.[22]

The sociological approach may suggest Marxism to some and raises the old question of the writer's social responsibility. Yet whatever our reaction or our answer, we may be reminded of Harry Levin's statement: "The relations between literature and society are reciprocal. Literature is not only the effect of social causes; it is also the cause of social effects." [23] The themes of modern

[18] Walter Loban, Margaret Ryan, and James R. Squire, *Teaching Language and Literature* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961), p. 602.

[19] Louise Rosenblatt, *Literature as Exploration* (New York: Progressive Education Association, 1938).

[20] Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 71–72.

[21] John B. Carroll, "Vectors of Prose Style," in *Style in Language* (New York: The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1960), p. 283.

[22] Ernest Jones, "The Oedipus Complex as an Explanation of Hamlet's Mystery," *American Journal of Psychology*, XXI (1910).

[23] Harry Levin, "Literature as an Institution," *Accent* (Spring, 1946).

fiction, especially, bring the sociological approach into a renewed prominence, after a couple of decades of little emphasis. It is no vagary of literary history that the two predominant forces in contemporary fiction are the southern writers, who often treat Negro-white relationships, and the northern Jewish writers. The Jews have a sense of mythology and a saving conception of irony born of a tradition of suffering. The southerners have their knowledge of the Bible and a sense of history plus a laid-on guilt complex stemming from slavery. Examination of group living, whether in the rural South or urban North, remains, as it must, a major concern of literature.

Despite what I have said about the primacy of the formal approach to literature, archetypal analysis, led by such critics as Northrop Frye, Maud Bodkin, and Leslie Fiedler, may be on the way to becoming a particularly significant approach in our time. Archetypal criticism seeks to find the common bases on which writer and reader can communicate, to "decode the secret language in literary works so that it may have for us a more rational meaning."[24] Perhaps, again, the nature of modern literature accounts for the acceleration of interest in the archetypal approach. We think of Eliot's concern with the myth of hero in a ravished land; Camus' preoccupation, natural perhaps with the existentialist, with the myth of Sisyphus; Wolfe's vision of the quest; MacLeish's retelling of the story of Job. Symptomatic, perhaps, is the awarding of the National Book Award for fiction of 1963 to John Updike's *The Centaur*, a book I referred to as "ridiculous" in my graduate seminar two days before the awards were announced. (Kind fate had me out of town at the time of the next meeting of the seminar!) Archetypal study is fruitful, too, with children's literature or literature for adolescents. A doctoral student in our department, Mrs. Helen Rosenblum, is completing a study on Jung's fusion-of-opposites archetypes in fairy tales. I have found that high school and college students seem fascinated with archetypes and patterns of ritual as they appear in literature. Tracing of the loss of paradise myth from the ancient Greeks through *Robinson Crusoe*, Wordsworth, and Robert Frost, for example, is of more significance to the student than learning a chronological list of names, movements, and influences.

That the various approaches will be combined by the competent literary scholar and that close textual analysis may be a method in any one of the approaches are axiomatic, of course. One brilliant example in the combination of formal and moral approaches, for instance, with close analysis as method, is Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren's "The Discovery of Evil: An Analysis of 'The Killers'."[25]

Research Technique

We now make the necessary and unique transition from facets of our discipline associated with English to those usually associated with professional

[24] Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

[25] In Robert P. Weeks, *Hemingway* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), pp. 114–117. Originally published in Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, *Understanding Fiction* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959), pp. 303–307.

education. The first of these later facets I have labeled earlier as research technique.

At the risk of appearing a barbarian quantifier to self-conscious professional humanists, the scholar of English education must know a good bit about research technique, including statistics and testing. Research in the teaching of English must necessarily remain, to some extent, an interdisciplinary effort in which the English education specialist may be a coordinator. Yet the various conferences on research in the teaching of English so far held under Project English, in three of four of which I have participated, have convinced me that we cannot merely bring together people who know English and people who know research design if results are to be maximal. The English education specialist, though he should be ready to call on the psychometrician and statistician at times, must be something of a psychometrician and statistician in his own right. Knowledge of measures of central tendency and of variation and of such techniques as analysis of variance and covariance and factor analysis is not, after all, so esoteric and so demanding in quantitative procedures that able graduate students cannot master it at elementary levels even if they have little formal training in mathematics.

One of the nostalgic myths that binds together those of us who were graduate students in English education at the University of Minnesota is our trial in the fire and brimstone of the courses in research design and statistical methods of the great Palmer O. Johnson, whose memory lives on at Minnesota and in the scholarly world. Looking back, we realize what we owe to Palmer, but then the present was traumatic! Years after I had left Minnesota, Dora V. Smith reported that Palmer's dog had bitten her, and I believe it was Dora V. herself who suggested that this was retribution for what her graduate students had said about the courses in research and statistics!

The English education specialist must play, of course, a key role in research in the teaching of English, a field about which the profession suddenly seems almost frenetic, though scholars in English education have for some time been advancing knowledge through several kinds of research.

There are first the status studies and surveys, some of which have been highly important. William Dusel's Stanford dissertation, for example, on professional responsibilities of English teachers and conditions of instruction in California schools has been widely cited.[26] Thurston Womack's Columbia dissertation in which he reported a survey of teachers' attitudes toward current English usage is another valuable study in this category.[27]

Historical studies in the teaching of English have been relatively rare. Donald Stahl, however, carried out at Northwestern an interesting study of the

---

[26] William J. Dusel, *Professional Responsibilities of English Teachers and Conditions of Instruction in California Secondary Schools* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1957).

[27] William T. Womack, *A Study of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Debatable Items of English Usage* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957).

development of the English curriculum in the Chicago Public Schools from 1856 to 1958.[28]

Third, there are the studies of relationships of factors, involving correlation and factor analysis. Many of these have been made, for example, on the relationship between knowledge of grammar and ability in written composition.

Analytical studies have been highly useful. These are of two kinds: first, analysis of content. Richard Alm's Minnesota dissertation dealt with assumptions about human experience in novels written for and about adolescents.[29] The second kind of analytical study is the cross sectional or longitudinal analysis of data. The well-known studies by Walter Loban[30] and Ruth Strickland[31] of the language of children are outstanding examples.

Case studies have been used very little in research in the teaching of English but may have a place, for instance, in the study of students' reactions to literature or in the study of the process through which effective writers are developed.

I wish to deal a little more fully with the sixth kind of research, the experimental study. Many of these have been done in the field of English, few of them significant. I think it an important responsibility of English education scholars to devise and supervise experimental studies which avoid common pitfalls of the past. A brief review of a few of these pitfalls may be in order. First, too short a term of experimentation. Such things as perception of form in literature or skill in organizing expository writing develop slowly, and discernible changes do not take place in a few weeks or months. Some potentially significant studies have been doomed at the outset for lack of a long-term test of hypothesis.

Control and analysis of variables is the major problem, of course, in experimental research. Comparisons of teaching approaches, with control and experimental groups, most often conclude on that dismal little refrain, "no significant difference." How to improve research design so as to glean more information from experimental studies is a major challenge. This was a theme sounded throughout the conference on research in English held in San Francisco preceding the NCTE convention last fall. Many of the speakers cited the need for more sophisticated, more imaginative research design. Professor Henry Meckel pointed out that the assumption of a simple stimulus-response relationship has vitiated many experimental studies. Between the pretest and post test lies not

---

[28] Donald Edgar Stahl, *The Development of the English Curriculum in the Chicago Public High Schools from 1856 to 1958* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1960).

[29] Richard S. Alm, *A Study of the Assumptions Concerning Human Experience Underlying Certain Works of Fiction Written for and about Adolescents* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1956).

[30] Walter Loban, *Language Ability in the Middle Grades.* Report on Contract Research Number SAE 7289 to U.S. Office of Education, March 1, 1961. See also Walter D. Loban, *The Language of Elementary School Children.* NCTE Research Report No. 1 (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963).

[31] Ruth G. Strickland, *The Language of Elementary School Children: Its Relationship to the Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Reading of Selected Children* (Bloomington: School of Education, Indiana University, July, 1962).

only the "treatment" per se but a body of human beings who are affected at any given time by factors other than the treatment. Especially are there those characteristics in the subject matter itself which may account for differences in outcome regardless of the method being tested. If Northrop Frye is right, for instance, it is easier to develop understanding of literature in the romantic or comic modes than in the tragic or ironic modes, and this factor could be crucial no matter what teaching method might be under test.

Then, too, research in the teaching of English has shared so far a limitation of studies in other areas of humanities and in the social sciences—a lack of follow-up or continuity. Promising studies have not been followed by others which results demand. A unique contribution of universities which have a number of graduate students in English education will be series of closely related studies in important areas. I have been interested in examining recently the research abstracts published by the Cardinal Stritch College in Milwaukee. Offering study only in reading and in education of the mentally handicapped, the graduate program has produced a number of closely related master's theses which as a whole represent a significant contribution.

Triviality, too, is an important indictment of experimental studies. We may be less suspect here than people in some other disciplines. Recently I read a report of a study in physical education of the problems of putting besetting inexperienced golfers. A conclusion was that a smooth surface presents fewer problems to a neophyte golfer than does an undulating surface!

The most vital quality in experimental research, perhaps, is imagination. Often graduate students drop a potentially significant study for one that is highly manageable and fits neatly into some statistical design. We can make a major contribution, I think, in initiating frontier studies in the more intangible, qualitative aspects of learning, for example the role of imagination in the literary experience.

A major reason for triviality in experimental research is the lack of techniques for measuring progress in some of the aspects of English we think most important. Testing in English has fallen on the sere and yellow. Scores on many commonly used standardized tests are virtually meaningless in really appraising the success of an English program. Clearly, the frontier of measurement in English is one on which activity by English education scholars, working with psychologists and test experts, is imperative. Such action has already begun. Interesting work in testing is going on in some of the Curriculum Study Centers. The Research Foundation of the NCTE is sponsoring a test construction project in literature under the direction of Margaret Early. J. N. Hook is coordinating a large project, just beginning, which enlists the help of teachers from all levels and constituents from all sections of the country.

Psychology of Learning

A staple in the training of most people who have studied education at the graduate level is the psychology of learning and child and adolescent development, and an educational psychology course is usually required of undergraduates preparing to teach. So in discussing briefly this facet of the discipline of English

education, I need not strike an evangelical stance. I'll content myself by striking instead a couple of moderately sour notes regarding the responsibilities in this field of scholars in English education.

It seems necessary, first, to keep a watchful eye out for dilettantism and amateurism. Everyone is an expert these days, if he chooses to so announce, on the learning of children and adolescents. Everyone has an English curriculum in his pocket. The very laudable movement to involve university scholars in elementary and secondary school curriculum planning has the disadvantage of augmenting dangers of amateurism, and our gloomiest vision, perhaps, is of platoons of professors marching off to school systems to mark out an iambic curriculum, five steps up and five steps back, based purely on the supposed logic of the subject, leaving behind a bewildered body of teachers and a sold-out estate of students.

Even within our own ranks, of course, where we assume some sophistication in learning theory, we have the common problem of the scholar in most fields today—keeping somewhere abreast of the expansion of knowledge. Programed learning comes into my mind at the moment. At first, I thought that if I looked the other way for a time, programed learning in English might go away. But it seems here to stay, no doubt to the benefit of the profession. My own solution, then, has been to talk a doctoral student into doing a dissertation on programed learning so that we both could learn something about it!

Seriously, we recognize some responsibility in applying to English recent scholarship in the learning process. Developments in cognitive psychology, in which the name of Jerome Bruner looms largest, have literally entranced the teaching world. The search for structure and spiral sequence in English, going on in the Curriculum Study Centers and elsewhere, is an exciting one, and yet attempts to Brunerize the English curriculum have brought some pangs of disillusionment. This is so partly because of the difficulty of consistently applying any theory to the preparation of specific classroom materials and to formulation of practical techniques. It is partly so, too, because the cognitive processes identified by the psychologists are not the whole thing, of course. There are also the affective responses so important in the humanities. It is necessary, yes, that a student studying a selection of literature be able to recall what he has read, comprehend the language, analyze the selection, evaluate it, and compare it to others. But of what real importance is this if he cannot respond to it emotionally, enter into it imaginatively?

An interesting practical application of the distinction between the cognitive processes and affective responses is made by Nathan Blount in an article on team teaching in the March issue of the *English Journal*.[32] (I really do read other periodicals—*True* and *Mad*, for example!) Dr. Blount feels that cognitive objectives, especially those involving the recall or recognition of knowledge or the development of intellectual skills and abilities, can be accomplished in large groups of students. Affective objectives, on the other hand, those which involve

[32] Nathan Blount, "Fructify the Folding Doors: Team Teaching Reexamined," *English Journal*, LIII (March, 1964), 177–180.

impact on the student in terms of interest, attitude, or values, are probably best suited to small group work.

We could say in summary that a special challenge to the scholar of English education is to reduce the mystique of learning in language and literature.

Philosophy and Sociology of American Education

A final note on philosophy and sociology of American education as a facet of our discipline. Again, almost anyone who has studied education in the graduate school has taken courses in this field, courses which vary widely in quality from campus to campus and from professor to professor. Here the English education specialist plays the role not only of scholar but of statesman. Provision of effective English programs for *all* students, not just the gifted or the mentally retarded, must remain, I think, a major objective, though some recent developments seem to distract us from it. There has been overconcern, perhaps, with the college-bound students. The most exciting new programs and new materials are appropriate only for the able students. The best teachers and prospective teachers want to teach "honors" sections.

Not a week has gone by in the nine years that I have edited the *English Journal* that letters have not come asking help in working with the linguistically untalented or the "reluctant" or "culturally disadvantaged" student. I am sure that many of you have been similarly besieged. One of the most significant conferences in recent years, it seems to me, is that organized by Arno Jewett and Doris Gunderson of the U.S. Office of Education on English for culturally different youth, from which came the excellent publication, *Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth*.[33] Important work in gearing English programs to the problems and characteristics of minority groups and lower class groups is going on at the Curriculum Study Center directed by Marjorie Smiley at Hunter College.

Ability grouping in English, now universal again in the high schools, works effectively apparently when students are carefully selected and programs are specifically geared to ability and cultural levels. Yet when we group students by ability in English, we group them at the same time, to a large degree, by social-economic background.

In constantly keeping foremost the objective of effective English programs for *all*, the English education scholar plays his role as statesman, turning a wary eye on the cold, classical fingers of the Rickovers and a discriminating ear to the siren voices of the oversimplifiers in education. As Allison Davis has said in the publication I mentioned a moment ago, "Our efficiency as a nation and the preservation of our position vis-a-vis the Communist powers depend largely upon our learning how to motivate and teach the lower socioeconomic groups in our schools."[34] The fact that we have brought under the roof of the same schoolroom

---

[33] Arno Jewett, Joseph Mersand, and Doris V. Gunderson (eds.), Bulletin 1964, No. 5 (Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

[34] Allison Davis, "Society, the School, and the Culturally Deprived Student," in *Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth, ibid.*, p. 10.

the genius and near moron, the patrician daughter and son of the slums, the robust and the broken in body, is, at once, the cultural challenge and the cultural achievement of our time.

To President Johnson's magnificent offensive against material poverty we can ally our offensive against cultural and linguistic poverty. The English language more and more is becoming a weapon of freedom abroad, as it has always been a weapon of freedom at home—freedom from provincialism and pedestrianism and vulgarity.

The hybrid role of the English education scholar is to synthesize from scholarship in English and in education that which is best, not for itself, but for *people* and for this commonwealth. The objectives of the discipline condemn us to be men of good will who become the sounding board for efforts to bring to realization Thomas Jefferson's dream of a truly literate democratic society.

IMPLICATIONS OF *Research in Written Composition*

Richard Corbin, Hunter College High School

Everyone here today is, I assume, familiar with the circumstances that led the Executive Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1960 to set up an *ad hoc* Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition. If you are not, then certainly you must at least be aware of the increasingly vocal public complaint that has been leveled at the writing of American students for the past ten years. It is this widespread criticism that has led individual teachers to reexamine their methods of teaching composition and in their resulting perplexity to turn to the Council for help. Part of the answer to this plea is the committee's report whose implications I have been asked to discuss today.

If you are concerned with the preparation of teachers of English in any way and have not yet read the committee's report, *Research in Written Composition*, especially Chapter III (which some of you received as a reprint in your convention packets at San Francisco), then I submit that you have no right to talk to your people on the subject of teaching composition until you do.

When this committee was constituted in answer to the popular hue and cry about the condition of student writing—indeed, all writing—in the United States in our time, some of us, as I recall, comfortably concluded that our search would uncover a plentiful supply of authoritative evidence to support our opinions, justify our methods, and confound our critics.

> Concerned over the nature of public pronouncements about how writing should be taught—the sound and the wild seem to share space equally in the press—the Executive Committee appointed an *ad hoc* Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition to review what is known and what is not known about the teaching and learning of composition and the conditions under which it is taught, for the purpose of preparing for publication a special scientifically based report on what is known in this area.[1]

We had not gone far in the examination of available research in this area of English teaching before disillusion set in!

In our charge from the Executive Committee of the Council we were asked to review and evaluate *all* research on the subject of composition and to submit at least a preliminary report within a period of about six months. Under the chairmanship of Richard Braddock we set to work with a will. But by the time we had identified 485 studies as relevant out of the more than 1,000 which we uncovered in our initial search, the deadline—like most normal and well-behaved deadlines—had faded, and the report appeared finally two years later, in 1963.

At its organization meeting in Washington in April, 1961, during the CCCC conference, the members of the committee agreed:

---

[1] Richard Braddock, *et al.*, *Research in Written Composition* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963), p. 1.

> . . . among other things, to limit its task to written composition and, more particularly, to studies in which some actual writing was involved (not studies entirely restricted to objective testing and questionnaires). The committee further decided to use only research employing "scientific methods," like controlled experimentation and textual analysis. At the suggestion of the Executive Committee, the *ad hoc* committee set as its goal the identification of the dozen or so most soundly based studies of the foregoing type.[2]

From several well-informed people that I questioned in a somewhat superficial way after receiving this assignment, I have obtained mixed reactions, ranging from "a very good report" to "the most depressing report ever." In between were the others, registering shock of less or greater intensity.

For looked at in one way, the findings reported by the committee, not on the state of our knowledge, but in effect on the state of our *un*knowledge about this currently sensitive area, are indeed rather shocking. Anyone who has digested the report and who respects the integrity of the committee must surely hesitate at this time to make any strong assertions about the teaching of composition, unless of course he puts stock in professional superstition or believes himself strongly endowed with "informed intuition." (While unanimously rejecting the former, of course, most of us probably do feel that we possess some degree of the latter!)

But if *Research in Written Composition* offers us a dismal picture of the state of our naiveté in the matter of teaching written composition, it also does, however, a number of other important things remarkably well. There is not time here to inquire into the English teacher's traditional resistance to what is popularly called "scientific method," except to note in passing that we have scant reason to question the philosophers who through the centuries have been reminding us that wisdom is born of the recognition of one's ignorance.

Where the teaching of composition is concerned, the report suggests that this is almost precisely the stage we are at. Thus we are ready to learn, and in Chapter III the report reviews what might be labeled the "half-knowledge" that is available to us from a number of studies which are grouped under the general headings: "Environmental Factors," "Institutional Factors," and "Rhetorical Considerations." The report then lists twenty-three basic areas of concern for the teacher of written composition that are largely untouched by research of any kind or quality, important guidelines, as it were, for those who in the future engage in research in this most important area of our professional concern.

This is not, however, the only important help contained in this report. For the committee in its work of reviewing research studies dealing with aspects of composition became increasingly aware that most of the studies and projects of the past had failed for a combination of identifiable reasons. To begin with, many of the investigators were little more than amateurs, harried candidates for higher degrees who had neither the time, the necessary training in research techniques, nor the adequate resources to carry on carefully planned and controlled studies. Though some of the more professional and elaborate studies demonstrated appreciation of the basic requirements of sound research, even here

[2] *Ibid.*

the investigators failed to achieve the control of variables, the research design, the objectivity that are considered more or less standard in comparable scientific and industrial research.

Concluding that little is likely to be added to our knowledge of the composition process if future investigators continue to repeat the mistakes and omissions of the past, the committee decided that one of its important functions must be to provide descriptions of the several research techniques that are applicable in studies of this kind. In the long run, this may well prove to be the committee's most valuable work, for the information and suggestions offered here to investigators in the area of composition are just as useful to investigators in other areas of English teaching—not impossibly for the whole field of education inquiry. Indeed, one might reasonably ask what the results of comparable studies in other areas of our profession might disclose.

Earlier this week, at a meeting in New York of representatives of the American Book Publishers Council and the American Textbook Publishers Institute with those of the NCTE, during which the state of research in English was given considerable attention, our past president, David Russell, suggested in a summary statement that we have perhaps reached the point where research projects carried on by individuals are no longer adequate to our needs, that the time has come for massive, coordinated attacks upon the central problems of teaching and learning English. Certainly we must all agree that the problem of teaching students to compose competently in English is one of the basic problems worrying our schools and colleges today.

In conclusion, I feel compelled to inject a personal query that I am certain is shared by other teachers of English. And I ask it aware of the rhetorical significance of a "misplaced" preface. Is "scientifically controlled research" in its usual sense possible in the discipline of "English"? Or more specifically, for our present purposes, is such research possible in the area of composition with all of its built-in variables and nonobjective factors?

And I answer myself: "Because we don't get 100 percent compositions in the classroom is no reason to stop assigning the writing of compositions. Our aim must be to improve research in English to the highest possible level, even as we recognize that we probably can never attain the degree of precision dreamed about. Even generalizations based on sound evidence can be extremely useful in determining the more effective ways to teach our subject."

I have come personally to the conclusion, largely as a result of my work with this committee, that "informed intuition"—in which I have always put my chief faith—is only possible when it *is* informed. And sound research in one important source of knowledge.

We have been so long in discovering what we don't know about the teaching of composition, and now we have so much to learn, that I am inevitably reminded of Chaucer's wry observation on his related problem, "The Lyf so shorte, the craft so long to lerne."

THE WISCONSIN PROJECT

Robert C. Pooley, Leonard V. Kosinski, John R. Searles

Jointly sponsored by the University of Wisconsin and the State Department of Public Instruction, the Wisconsin English Language Arts Curriculum Project is a federally supported continuation of a statewide curriculum activity initiated in 1959 by the Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English. Unlike most other curriculum centers, the Wisconsin Center is the outgrowth of English teachers themselves in answer to a recognized need for language arts curriculum improvement. From this basic fact, the operation of the Wisconsin Center differs from that of other centers in being a statewide program of inservice education, involving every elementary school teacher and every high school teacher of English who consents to join the activities of the center. Local participation consists in attendance at meetings of a volunteer committee, to discuss and evaluate materials sent out from the curriculum center. At present writing (February, 1964) there are 48 elementary committees and 89 high school committees at work on curriculum ideas and materials. A rough estimate would indicate that 1,183 teachers are involved as well as a considerable number of administrators and supervisors.

Obviously so widespread an operation must rest upon personal contacts and written follow-up. The project directors have devoted the major part of their time to school visits, meeting groups from ten to several hundred teachers at conferences initiated by the local schools. In September, 1963, every school administrator, every elementary school teacher, and every high school teacher of English and related subjects received a copy of an announcement, giving details of the project and inviting participation. The response has been gratifying, and the invitations to the directors exceed the time available. In time every school in the state that desires to participate will be contacted, either by a visit of a director to the school, or by attending a meeting at a central point to which a number of small schools are invited.

Study of the English Language Arts has been divided into three areas of emphasis. In the school year 1963–64 the attention is focused upon the teaching of literature and the encouragement of voluntary reading in grades K–12. For the school year 1964–65 the attention shifts to the communicative arts of speaking and writing. In the third year, 1965–66, the emphasis is upon the English language, including grammar. The final year of the project, 1966–67, will be devoted to the verification of teachers' experience with the temporary curriculum guidelines, final editing, and the publication of the recommended statewide curriculum in the English Language Arts, grades K–12.

Contact with local committees is maintained by a series of bulletins, one set for the elementary grades, and one set for grades 7–12. These bulletins take the form of editorial discussion, including reading references and classroom practices, in specific aspects of teaching English. Some subjects dealt with so far are principles underlying the teaching of literature; free reading and book reports; teaching literature by themes; the use of audiovisual material to enrich

the literature program; literature as the basis of creative dramatic activities; folk literature; and approaches to poetry. Each bulletin contains an answer sheet to be filled out by the group leader, indicating the number of persons in the group discussion, the grades represented, and the opinions and suggestions of the group in answer to specific questions. This material is collected and tabulated by staff assistants, and will be used for reference in the actual curriculum writing.

During the spring of 1964 preliminary materials for the guidelines to the teaching of literature will be prepared in the office. A panel workshop of twenty-five selected leading teachers has been invited to gather at Stevens Point State College, July 19 to August 1, to draft the details of the literature guidelines. These will be edited in August, published in September, and distributed to schools by October, for experimental use. Work will then proceed on the same pattern for speaking and writing, with two workshops in 1965, and for language and grammar the following year with two workshops in 1966.

The product of the Wisconsin project will in quantitative terms be less extensive than that of other centers, where attention is focused upon materials. The unique aspect of the Wisconsin project is the active involvement of so large a number of teachers in their own schools in the development of the curriculum. By this procedure it is hoped that the final curriculum will reach prepared and activated teachers, acquainted with the basic ideas of the new curriculum, and eager to apply them to the teaching of their classes. Only by some such procedures can a curriculum genuinely improve the teaching of the language arts in an entire state.

ROBERT C. POOLEY, *Director*
LEONARD V. KOSINSKI, *Associate Director*
Wisconsin English-Language Arts Curriculum Project

To the statement just concluded I should like to add a few words to set the project into the context of other significant activities in the state of Wisconsin. Early in his statement, Dr. Pooley mentioned that the curriculum project has been an outgrowth of an earlier study sponsored by the Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English. This organization, which was formed in October, 1958, had a membership as of March 1, 1964, of 1,358, including elementary, high school, and college teachers. Besides its impressive growth in membership and its notable list of publications, it pioneered in informing school administrators of the aims and needs of teachers of English through a special bulletin issued periodically. It publishes and distributes an honor roll of schools which have complied with the recommendations of the National Council with respect to teacher load. It has played an important part in raising certification standards for secondary teachers. The membership of the Steering Committee of the Curriculum Project coincides very closely with that of the earlier Curriculum Committee of the Wisconsin Council. It is safe to predict that when the findings of the curriculum study are made available, members of the Wisconsin Council will be the leaders in implementing them in the classroom.

Another development which has helped to create a favorable climate for the curriculum study is the Wisconsin Improvement Project launched in June, 1959, through a substantial grant from the Ford Foundation. Under the directorship of Dr. John Guy Fowlkes of the University of Wisconsin, this program has developed a teacher internship in many fields and has involved other collegiate institutions in cooperative ventures in teacher education. Most noteworthy from the standpoint of its relationship to the business of teacher education is the involvement of many schools and teachers in the business of teacher education. The English internship, for example, has grown from fewer than a dozen interns at the start to thirty-eight this year, and probably fifty to sixty in 1964–65. At present twelve Wisconsin school systems have English interns, and more will be assimilated into the program next year and in the years to come. The public schools of Racine have taken part this year in what may prove to be a most important development in the education of teacher interns: Racine has become a local teacher education center with local administration and supervision. Most of the work has been assumed by the English supervisor of the Racine Public Schools, who in the summer has held a university appointment to help prepare interns on campus for their work the following year. Beginning with six English interns each semester of this academic year, Racine will probably double the number next year. More significant than growth in numbers is the immediate and complete involvement of teachers and school systems in the improvement of teacher education. Like the Wisconsin Council and the Wisconsin Curriculum Project, the teacher internship fostered by the Wisconsin Improvement Program has drawn on leaders within the state to promote grass roots operations involving many schools and teachers in a working partnership to improve teaching. Such a combination of efforts cannot but bear good fruit.

JOHN R. SEARLES
Professor of English and Education
University of Wisconsin

THE FLORIDA PROJECT

John S. Simmons, Florida State University

Certainly one of the most threadbare of educational clichés is the term, "felt need." In the establishment of the Florida State University Curriculum Center in English, however, this term must be seen to have some significance. It is the assumption of the directors of our Curriculum Center that there is definite need for experimental research in English curricula used at the junior high school level. To us it would seem that much of what passes for courses of study at the junior high level is largely chaotic; that this curriculum is frequently seen to be a sort of helter-skelter arrangement of various components of the discipline of English. These components appear to drift into the junior high no-man's-land from two directions: the upper elementary grades and the senior high school.

Thus what we have set out to do in our Center is to develop, implement, and evaluate carefully organized English curricula at the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. Our aim in following these procedures is twofold: (1) to compare the effectiveness of organized curricula with those which have no apparent directional emphasis and (2) to identify whatever varying degrees of effectiveness may be found among the experimental curricula we have developed.

More specifically, our plan calls for the construction of three distinct junior high curricula to be labeled "experimental." At present the seventh grade editions of these three curricula are just about completed, and several of us have recently returned from a series of what can roughly be called "orientation meetings" with teachers and administrators of our six guinea pig schools. If, hopefully, these teachers recover from the shock of what we have described as "curricula" by next September, they will man the seventh grade program, and the show will truly be on the road. During that time the Department of English Education at Florida State will be busily preparing eighth grade offerings which we will then present, next spring, to the teachers involved, and so on.

With that somewhat rambling progress report completed, it would probably be appropriate to describe the nature of the curricula themselves. After extensive investigations of authoritative statement, theoretical discussion, state and local curriculum guides, and the like, we have come to discern three basic rationales which most consistently underly these statements of course instructors. The first of these we have converted into a track which we call "subject matter blocs," and it is composed of a series of instructional units based to some extent on the now famous Tri-Component Curriculum of the Portland Public Schools. This curriculum is based purely on the logic of the subject, featuring several units on language, literature, and written composition. Thus in this curriculum, those components of the English curriculum felt to be most significant separately are studied and are approached as having value in and of themselves.

Curriculum II in the series is called a thematic curriculum. The concept for this curriculum is hardly a new one; it has appeared in published statements for several decades. In this approach, a theme, based on some aspect of human experience which is of widespread and continuing significance, is introduced and

described to the students. The sequence of activities which follows this introduction is quite regular: from opening statement to further exploration of theme through the reading of various literary selections, to the writing and discussing of reactions to these selections, to the study of principles and problems of language found both in the selections read and the students' oral and written reactions. The theme at all times is held in a position of central importance.

The third and last experimental curriculum can be called a sequential skills curriculum and in theory is based on some interpretations of several of the ideas concerning the "spiral curriculum" of Jerome Bruner as stated in his well-known book, *The Process of Education*, as well as those of other cognitive psychologists. In this curriculum an attempt is made to integrate the skills found in language, literature, and composition. This is done first by implementing instruction which emphasizes the *cluster* of skills. Later this emphasis is placed on individual aspects of the discipline of English. A brief description of the seventh grade program should provide a more lucid illustration of these concepts. The first of four phases emphasizes structure and *small* units of meaning in language, literature, and composition. Language and composition activities are complementary here. Concern with the structure of literature includes discussion of plot, setting, and characterization, as well as anticipating the study of what Northrop Frye has defined as the modes of fiction by introducing common fictional devices such as mistaken identity or excess as part of comedy. Activities also follow Bruner's suggestions. Pupils are asked to complete stories on their own which follow the pattern of comedy or mystery. The second phase places a greater stress on small units of meaning but at the same time continues to deal with structure. The importance of content in the English language is a major area of concern here, as well as beginning work with symbols. Language, literature, and composition skills are grouped around the study of "meaning." The third phase places its main consideration on organization or structure on a more complex level: the fourth and final phase emphasizes enlarged areas of meaning.

As we have worked toward the development of the several activities of our curricula, we have invariably been faced with the need for competence in two areas which are of crucial importance to the specialist in English education. First of these necessities can be described as a substantial grounding in the three major components of our discipline: language, literature, and composition. Without these understandings, it would be well nigh impossible to set up programs of study which honestly represent the subject we endeavor to teach. Second, we have been made aware of the continuing need for the use of these insights which aid in the effective manipulation of our subject matter. That is, we have continued to work in the realization of the gap between the readiness and capacities of seventh graders and the stuff of literary and linguistic scholarship. Our dual responsibility, then, has been to identify significant areas with the study of English and then to break these areas down into components teachable to junior high school students. Wherever we find him and at whatever task, the specialist in English education must be proficient in both of these callings.

Lest it be inferred from the pleasant sounding pronouncements made previously that all has been rosy, I must hasten to say that we have had our prob-

lems during this year of preparing materials. Furthermore, each of these problems has clearly discernible implications for the field of English education. Foremost among these concerns is our growing realization that there is *still* a rather large gap between the theorist on the university campus and the practicing secondary school teacher in the field. This has become glaringly evident as we have introduced cooperating teachers to our materials and as we have discussed "new approaches" with them. Inevitably, I suppose, we have encountered cases of lack of awareness, indifference, reluctance, and even resistance during these conferences. From such reactions an inference can be drawn: that despite the widespread excitement aroused during the last five or six years over the teaching of English at the state, regional, and national levels, many teachers still adhere to a number of practices which are, to say the least, time-honored. It is difficult to discuss broad curricular objectives and varieties of approaches with teachers who half-listen while they clutch, rather tenaciously, the 1928 anthology, good old *Ivanhoe*, and the grammar workbook. This is particularly evident when discussion turns to to such topics as structural approaches to language study or to modern literary scholarship.

A second problem, that of finding appropriate materials for all three curricula, has been particularly vexing. Some of our noblest unit theories (one on folklore and legendry is an excellent sample of this) have been most difficult to develop because of our inability to find enough texts and pamphlets, for instance, which portray the legends and folktales adequately and are at the same time comprehensible at the seventh grade level. This situation is partially due, I suspect, to some unrealistic expectations on the part of the curriculum makers, but this does not change the fact that the range of materials we need to implement our instructional activities is frequently not available.

Next problem. While we have no actual proof as yet that the problem exists, we *anticipate* substantial difficulty with the whole business of testing. Certainly there has been a great deal of research and authoritative speculation into the whole area of evaluating the outcomes of various teaching techniques, concepts, and materials in the English curriculum, but the major components, as teachable entities, remain tough to measure. We are still not comfortable, for instance, in measuring, among other things:

1. Responses to insights into imaginative literature.
2. Breadth of understanding of linguistic principles.
3. Ability of students to transfer classroom composition instruction into their own written work.

There are others. We will let you know more precisely in about four years just how well founded our apprehensions were, but let it suffice to say that at present we are uneasy about testing.

A further question which has continued to plague us (for which, incidentally, we hope for some helpful information from other projects) is that of the relative impact of language learning in younger students. We are not really sure how this learning of linguistic principles and understandings takes place in the broad sense. How does increased useful understanding of the English language develop? Is such understanding facilitated by different instructional approaches

at different grade levels? From another direction, we have had trouble developing language activities in the thematic units. If language instruction should "grow out of concern with the central theme," to what extent can we structure for participating teachers what is to be taught in each unit or at each grade level? To provide careful structuring would seem to be anticipating linguistic principles and problems in students' written and spoken reactions. We are reluctant to set up detailed instruction in language, and yet we are haunted by the fear that, given the opportunity, some teachers will return post haste to the labeling of parts of speech and the diagraming of sentences that they love so well.

Our final problem is "final" only in the sense that I don't have much left of my allotted "10 to 12" minutes. We are concerned that, although the three curricula we have constructed are quite different from each other in theory, in the day-by-day developmental activities, the assignments, and the reactions sought from literary selections, there may persist a certain *sameness* which would make it hard for the casual observer of what we are doing to see the professed distinctiveness of the curricula. In other words, no matter how hard we have tried to be original, creative, refreshing, or what have you, some elements of the program seem quite similar to each other and also to things which have been happening in the English classroom for a long time.

Despite all our traumatic revelations, we have learned much during this first year of operation. Most pertinent to this conference is our growing realization that the training we have been giving our undergraduates in the methods course is not necessarily as broad as we had thought it was. As we have wrestled with the problems involved in developing a set of truly functional curricula for junior high school students *and* teachers, we have learned that many things must be added to our undergraduate program in order that it actually cover grades seven through twelve. We have learned, in short, to accept, to understand, and to utilize the "you just can't do this at this level" kind of suggestion from experienced practitioners into our curricula and also to transmit these suggestions into new ideas for our teacher training program.

ORGANIC FORM: THE PRIMARY CONCEPT TO BE TAUGHT IN LITERATURE

Dorothy Petitt, San Francisco State College

To think what concepts are to be taught in literature is to assume that some should be taught. I assume, then, that we are agreed that literature has potential value in the lives of human beings and that teaching literature can help students to discover that value. My assignment is not to present an apology for literature or for teaching literature. It is to consider with you what concepts should be taught, granted that some should be. In discussing what concepts should be taught in literature, I hope to raise some questions about when and how they are to be taught.

Much of the confusion in designing the curriculum in literature may be rooted in the difference between a concept and a piece of literature. A concept is a general, abstract, universal idea or notion, usually conceived in the mind through thought, although it may also be conceived through intuition. Literature, on the other hand, is the concrete detailed illustration of an idea, which may never be stated. Literature, too, is conceived in the mind of its author and also reconceived in the mind of its reader or else it has no public existence. Since we are discussing what concepts we should teach in literature, what interests us chiefly is the reconception of a piece of literature in the mind of its reader through some proportionate combination of intuition and thought. We want to help our student readers learn how to enter into the author's words so fully that they, in effect, become the author, as Virginia Woolf has put it.[1] We are more interested in students' experiencing a piece of literature than we are in their conceptualizing its significance or generalizing about its form. Although we often lead students to conceptualize in order to teach them how to read literature, the concept is the means, not the end.

As our student readers become the author, both thought and feeling come into play. The author designed it that way by concentrating on carefully structured detail. He may generalize, as Sandburg does in "Flying Fish," by starting with his conclusion:

> I have lived in many half-worlds myself . . . and so I know you.

The concept of living in half-worlds can be only vaguely associated with the flying fish, however, until Sandburg has spelled out some of the details of how he happened to see the fish:

> I leaned at a deck rail watching a monotonous sea . . .

A monotonous sea is a more specific generalization, but Sandburg immediately further specifies the monotony both in detail and in rhythm:

> . . . the same circling birds and the same plunge of furrows carved
> by the plowing keel.

---

[1] Virginia Woolf, "How Should One Read a Book?" in her *The Common Reader* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1948), pp. 281–295.

With the stage set for his intuition and thought, he expresses both:

> I leaned so . . . and you fluttered struggling between two waves in the air now . . . and then under the water and out again . . . a fish . . . a bird . . . a fin thing . . . a wing thing.

In "a fin thing . . . a wing thing," he summarizes the meaning of his experience, the pauses giving the effect of his stumbling on these phrases in his musing. "Fin thing" seems to select "wing thing" inexorably, just as the meaning of his experience seems to arise inevitably out of the details he has sketched. Then, finally, he reinterprets:

> Child of water, child of air, fin thing and wing thing . . . I have lived in many half-worlds myself . . . and so I know you.[2]

It might be valid to say that the concepts that should be considered in reading this piece of literature with students are those generalizations which Sandburg himself has stated. But his poem, we have already noted, is more than a statement. There is the rhythm of "the same circling birds and the same plunge of furrows carved by the plowing keel," the rhyme of "a fin thing . . . a wing thing," the symbol of the half-worlds; all three and other poetic elements too are also making statements, underlining those being made through the meaning of the words. The combination of form and idea makes this a poem, the interpreted re-creation of an experience through, as Wallace Stevens would put it, "flawed words and stubborn sounds."[3] The concepts to be taught to the student reader of the poem, then, concern both idea and form.

A piece of literature, after all, is a work of art, a significant theme given a shape. Either to study the theme without studying the form or to study the form without paying attention to the theme which the form shapes is not studying literature. Henry James' metaphor for the creation of fiction surely also applies to its re-creation in the mind of the reader of any piece of literature:

> The story and the novel, the idea and the form, are the needle and the thread, and I never heard of a guild of tailors who recommended the use of the thread without the needle, or the needle without the thread.[4]

Study focusing primarily on idea may become a branch of the social sciences—sociology or history—or a study of philosophy or psychology. Study chiefly of form becomes a study of structure, of the grammar of literature, ignoring the way in which literature imitates life to illuminate it.

Perhaps because study of form has seemed sterile to many English teachers, particularly in elementary school and in secondary schools, they have solved the difficulty by avoiding it. Discussion about appreciation has concentrated on what the literature has to say. For example, when the research studies summarized in the NCRE pamphlet, *Development of Taste in Literature*, prepared by a Com-

---

[2] Carl Sandburg, "Flying Fish," in *Complete Poems* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1950), p. 236.

[3] Wallace Stevens, "Poems of Our Climate," in *Collected Poems* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961) pp. 193–194.

[4] Henry James, *The Art of Fiction and Other Essays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 18.

mittee of the National Conference on Research in English, do take account of the literary factors which differentiate between the shoddy and the excellent, only general phrases are used: "the truth or falsity of the author's presentation of human experience," "originality," "authenticity," "validity," "universality."[5] The picture of life painted by a given piece of literature is to be judged by some abstract standard of truth but whose standard is not stated. In Bertha Handlan's investigation of adolescents' reading tastes, did the girls who liked *Sue Barton, Student Nurse* because it seemed to them true-to-life have enough experience of either life or literature to be able to judge?[6] Why does Sue Barton seem to us undesirable as a steady literary diet? Isn't the picture of life the whole series presents created by the way in which it is presented, by the shallow characters, who, being supercapable in the first place, lack individuality and couldn't possibly develop through efforts to resolve any real conflicts?

The primary concept to be taught in literature, the concept undergirding the teaching of all other concepts, should be that theme and form, idea and craft, are two aspects of an organic whole. Coleridge's concept of organic form is not, of course, to be abstracted and taught theoretically, at least not until the reader has had sufficient experience with literature, taught as an organic whole, to be able to generalize.[7] Graduate school may be the most appropriate place. Until that time, the elementary, the secondary, and the college teacher of English need to be providing experiences in studying literature which connect theme and form, students becoming increasingly conscious of literary technique as they progress.

The early stages of teaching literature are, as Margaret Early has pointed out, times of much unconscious delight in reading many pieces of literature.[8] In the elementary school the groundwork is laid for future self-conscious and the ultimate conscious appreciation of literature. Teaching the concept of organic form in the elementary grades is first of all selecting pieces of literature which have such form: subjects, delightful to children, expressed in language which, too, provides delight. The first grade teacher who reads "Mice" by Rose Fyleman to her students is both giving them a chance to see something they know about from a new point of view and introducing them to a structure very like that of Sandburg's "Flying Fish," starting out with a generalization and ending with the same generalization, modified, however, by what has come in between:

MICE

by Rose Fyleman

I think mice

---

[5] Committee of the National Conference on Research in English, Nila Banton Smith (chm.), *Development of Taste in Literature* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963).

[6] Bertha Handlan, *A Comparison of the Characteristics of Certain Adolescent Readers and the Qualities of the Books They Read* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1945), pp. 34–35.

[7] Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Shakespearean Criticism*, ed. Thomas M. Raysor (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930).

[8] Margaret J. Early, "Stages of Growth in Literary Appreciation," *English Journal*, XLIX (March, 1960), 161–167.

Are nice.[9]

The first grade teacher would probably let students feel the form of this poem rather than talk about it. Before reading the poem, the class might be encouraged to talk about whether or not they think mice are nice. After hearing it, they might discuss whether the poem has given them a picture of mice they didn't have before; in short, they will talk about the content. Yet even the first grade teacher might get the students to wondering why the *rather* of the beginning: "I think mice/Are rather nice," is left out in the last stanza and why the *But* is added and the *I* underlined: But *I* think mice/Are nice." In such speculation, students are considering form.

They are beginning to think about their experience of reading the poem, to connect their reaction with its sources, always, however, nontechnically, in the context of the piece being discussed. In developing tests of literary appreciation as one factor in general aesthetic appreciation, the English researchers, Williams, Winter, and Wood, concluded: "A capacity for literary appreciation is discernible in a primitive form, at a much earlier age than is generally assumed, and increases steadily with increasing age."[10] By primitive form they mean implicit awareness rather than abstract formulation in technical literary terms.

Children's literature is rich with opportunities for children to enjoy the content consciously and to experience unconsciously, or with a rudimentary awareness, how form shapes content. Even such a noted novelist and critic as Caroline Gordon has traced the parallels between the plot structure of Beatrix Potter's *Jemima Puddleduck* and the classic tragic plot structure of *Oedipus Rex*.[11] There are many stories and poems for the elementary and secondary teacher to choose from, all of which offer an opportunity for children to experience the organic form of literature.

Such experience ought to be both a delight in itself and a preparation for further study, engendering deeper delight and wisdom because it can probe more deeply into complexities of theme and form. As Jerome Bruner has suggested, the literature curriculum, too, might well be conceived as a spiral. He asks:

---

[9] Rose Fyleman, "Mice," in May Hill Arbuthnot, *Time for Poetry* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1952), p. 53.

[10] E. D. Williams, L. Winter, and J. M. Woods, "Tests of Literary Appreciation," *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 8 (November, 1938), 283.

[11] Caroline Gordon, *How to Read a Novel* (New York: Viking Press, 1957), pp. 24–25.

> If it is granted, for example, that it is desirable to give children an awareness of the meaning of human tragedy and a sense of compassion for it, is it not possible at the earliest appropriate age to teach the literature of tragedy in a manner that illuminates but does not threaten?[12]

A spiral curriculum based on tragic literature would concentrate on the primary concept to be taught: organic form. Bruner suggests that such a spiral might start with a retelling of the great myths. After that, I would like to suggest that, paradoxically, it should probably be rooted chiefly in comedy and never, in its total spiraling out to include more experiences and deeper experiences in reading literature, exclude comedy. Comedy is a way of giving dimension to tragedy through contrast; including it is also a way of considering the emotional and literary maturity of young people.

How early, after all, are young people prepared to consider the idea of failure, noble failure, but final failure? How soon have they had enough experience to feel both pity and fear in confronting the idea of irrevocable commitment to evil, in confronting, say, the tragedy of the hardened heart of Macbeth, who was "in blood/Stepp'd so far" that he realized he could not turn back?[13] It is true that we introduce the idea of evil pure in myths and fairy tales to very young children, but both myths and fairy tales are set in worlds very remote from ordinary human existence. Their richness and strangeness are probably among their chief appeals. Between the myths and the fairy tales and the great tragedies—and all real tragedies are great or else they are sad or pathetic stories, not tragedies—between these should come many experiences both in life and in literature which help students simultaneously to discover human limitations and to perceive the possibilities of existing meaningfully, not passively, within those limitations. Without both discoveries, seeing the effort of a human being attempting to transcend his limitations as noble, seeing his failure as tragic, becomes almost impossible.

Thus after the center spiral is set in fairy tales and myths, the spiral curriculum in tragic literature might well concentrate on comedy, which presents the possibility of a return to order. The final order will be altered from the opening order because in between will have come straying, delightful in retrospect at least, because the outcome has proved to be satisfactory. The human possibilities will be narrowed, but the characters will not have been defeated, as they are in tragedy.

As one translation of a haiku by Basho puts it:

> Now the swinging bridge
> Is quieted with creepers
> Like our tendrilled life.[14]

The gentleness of tendrils represents a comic view appropriate to young people whose incomplete lives are just beginning to find their shape. They are not

---

[12] Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 52–53.

[13] Dolora G. Cunningham, "Macbeth: The Tragedy of the Hardened Heart," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, XIV (Winter, 1963), 39–47.

[14] Basho in *Japanese Haiku* (Mount Vernon, N.Y.: Peter Pauper Press, 1956).

ready to contemplate defeat, however noble, with compassion before they have experienced partial defeat and partial success in both life and literature. Comedy can simultaneously humble and exalt students because it helps them see that they, like Wallace Stevens' blackbird, are a small part, but still a part, of the pantomime.[15] Thus elementary students who have read Hans Christian Andersen's "The Emperor's New Clothes," or junior high girls who have giggled over *The Innocent Wayfaring* by Marchette Chute may ultimately in high school or college be able really to read both *Twelfth Night*, a comic view of the results of mistaking one's own identity and the identity of others, and *Othello*, a tragic view of the same human weakness.

Bruner suggests that another way of conceiving the spiral curriculum in literature might be in terms of literary themes.[16] The power of form to shape themes could be kept always in view through the method of teaching individual pieces of literature. Thematic possibilities are many, as Henry James points out in "The Art of Fiction" about the creation of reality in fiction:

> Humanity is immense, and reality has a myriad forms; the most one can affirm is that some of the flowers of fiction have the odor of it, and others have not; as for telling you in advance how your nosegay should be composed, that is another affair.[17]

It will be almost impossible here to begin to suggest themes for the curricular nosegay, themes that might be developed spirally from the kindergarten through college. Dwight Burton has suggested that we use four fundamental humanistic relationships expressed in literature—man and deity; man and other men; man and nature; man and his inner self—as sources of unity in the total English curriculum.[18] *Robinson Crusoe*, for instance, develops the theme of man's ability to cope with himself in isolation; *Call It Courage*, *Island of the Blue Dolphins*, and *Alone* are all books which might appear sequentially in the development of that theme, starting, perhaps, in the fifth grade. Certainly any student who had read all these books would come to *Robinson Crusoe* prepared to cope with its more complex theme. Perhaps any given school system would want to work out themes and variations as well as levels at which given themes would be emphasized as appropriate to learners at the stage of experience. For example, understanding some of the significant themes of a historical period of literature might well be left for the upper secondary college bound students, the understanding to flower more fully in college. Recognizing that they might have plucked other thematic flowers equally real, the teachers who develop a thematic curriculum can both enjoy their current bouquet and be free in the future to change its composition without sacrificing the advantages of spiral growth in skill and understanding.

It would be equally possible for teachers to devise a spiral curriculum in literature based on concepts of form. In such a sequence, the method of teaching

---

[15] Wallace Stevens, "Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Blackbird," in *Harmonium* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1953), p. 158.

[16] Bruner, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[17] James, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[18] Dwight L. Burton, "Trailing Clouds of Boredom Do They Come," *English Journal*, LI (April, 1962), 262.

would need to keep the object of teaching any piece of literature in view; namely, the understanding of the idea shaped by the art.

Some secondary schools have developed a spiral genre curriculum; each year students read increasingly complex essays, short stories, novels, poems, dramas, and biographies with a growing awareness of the structures and techniques both typical of each literary type and shared among types.[19] Such a curriculum is often particularly successful with poetry, which, the better it is, the more it defies thematic classification. Sometimes these curricula, at some points at least, unite the study of the structures of a particular genre with the study of theme, as, for example, the study of the theme of alienation in modern novels and short stories.

Another method of using formal literary concepts to organize the curriculum might focus on formal structures both of the whole and of parts, structures which recur in several literary types. It would probably not be desirable to sustain a complete curriculum organized around the formal concepts of point of view or sentence structure, or around internal structures based on sound, such as rhyme, rhythm, and alliteration, which bind words, and thus ideas, together. Yet perhaps in the senior high school years, a study abstracting any of these three kinds of formal concepts from varied experience in studying them organically in thematic units or studies of genre might be very enlightening to students.

Such study would cut across both themes and types. It would have a human value in itself. Can you think of any single idea for a student to leave his study of literature with more important than the realization that the point of view of the see-er establishes what is seen; that what is seen, therefore, is relative to the condition of him who sees it? For instance, the point viewed in poetry is usually some outward circumstance so stated that it will reveal the inner weather of the viewer, who may or may not be the poet. A good example is E. V. Rieu's delightful "Night Thought of a Tortoise Suffering from Insomnia on a Lawn":

> The world is very flat;
> There is no doubt of that.[20]

Here the point of view is so specified that the conclusion is inevitable. Junior high school students reading this poem would certainly profit by discussing how, the conditions being changed, the tortoise might reach different conclusions. What might he decide about the world if, though it is highly unlikely, he were on a mountain peak? Or if it were a deer, not a tortoise, suffering from insomnia, what might the deer decide? Would Columbus have agreed with the tortoise?

Behind every poem, however, there is also the voice of a poet. The study of several works of a single poet might be a valid means of beginning to consider what his characteristic point of view is, as far as these poems reveal it. A teacher might, for instance, select some of the more somber poems of Robert

[19] The Tamalpais, California, School District is one which has organized its senior high school curriculum by types. For information about its course of study, write to James Pierce, Redwood High School, Larkspur, California.

[20] E. V. Rieu, *The Flattered Flying Fish and Other Poems* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1962), p. 53.

Frost to correct the experience of a class who, up to that point, had read only his more bucolically optimistic poems.

Just as deciding from whose point of view his story is to be told is the key question for a writer of fiction,[21] discovering how the point of view adopted by the author establishes his theme is the key to reading fiction. Fiction is not a slice of life, even in so-called naturalistic fiction, but something ordered to look like life as someone perceives it. If the point of view of the author is omniscient, the importance of any single individual dwindles, as it does, for instance, with Guy de Maupassant. If the point of view is the first person, the fiction both is shaped by the voice of the speaker and shapes the reader's understanding of the speaker's character. Reading many stories told from different points of view with an increasingly conscious awareness of how the choice of who shall tell the story forms its meaning becomes an important human experience because it establishes the idea that reality is relative to the eye of the beholder. Since the concept is a sophisticated one, presupposing many experiences of seeing through different points of view in different pieces of literature, it probably should be reserved for the later secondary years for direct study. Then, however, there could well be several increasingly complex units directly studying point of view in all literary genres, including drama, where the study becomes more complicated. Faulkner's *As I Lay Dying*, as the core experience in one of the later units, might be an exciting discovery for a junior or senior class who had, at lower levels, begun the spiral, nontechnical study of point of view as they studied themes or genres.

The direct study of sentence structure should be more limited than the study of point of view, but no less significant. It has potentially a direct connection with the application of structural linguistic study to teaching writing. Francis Christensen's study of the generative rhetoric of the sentence rose directly from his study of how sentences in the best modern fiction are constructed on the principle of additions which increasingly specify.[22] Such a study undertaken by high school juniors or seniors might do much to unlock the hoard of specific impressions often kept so safely from expression by a cloud of sweeping generalizations. Short stories by Hemingway, Crane, Katherine Mansfield at her best, Eudora Welty, Kay Boyle, and other modern writers might be used as the basis for the intensive study of how sentence structure echoes and specifies the experience it contains.

It would be easy to lead into the study of internal structures from the study of sentence structure. Rhythm could provide the transition. However, the study of rhyme, rhythm, and alliteration, to name the three most common ways in which the sounds of words connect ideas, could very well have received direct, though not extended, attention much earlier in the spiral curriculum. From kindergarten on, children are fascinated by the sounds of words, usually expressing their understanding by repeating or imitating. Such study, if you can call the joyous release of spontaneity study, is continuous, not unified at

[21] Percy Lubbock, *The Craft of Fiction* (New York: Viking Press, 1957), p. 251.

[22] Francis Christensen, "A Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence," *College Composition and Communication*, XIV (October, 1963), 155-161.

any given point in time; yet in the senior high school, I can well imagine several short units, perhaps in connection with the study of poetry, on the sounds of words, units which probe increasingly more deeply into the spell the sounds exercise. Seniors could very well leave high school understanding how iambic pentameter, like the English language, is flexible; and how the rhyme scheme of a sonnet gives a formal shape to the development of the idea it expresses, often a soft subject hard formed.

Diction, metaphor, symbol, and image could also all be studied directly early in the curriculum without being labeled, the study increasing in scope and depth each year, and the labels being applied only after much study. A brief unit on the echoes of words might well be initiated very early in the elementary grades, perhaps in connection with learning how to use the dictionary, and be repeated each year with increasingly deeper awareness of the richness of meaning in English vocabulary. Such a unit would involve deciding why a poet used one word rather than another as well as making decisions about words students want to use in their own writing. A similar study of metaphor should yield equally rich results, nipping incipient triteness in the bud. The direct study of symbols could start at the point when the direct study of language is begun and continue on from that point. Haiku, often read in the seventh and eighth grades because the interpretation of a single image enables students to grasp its meaning, could be at the center of a direct study of imagery, a study which would permeate the curriculum thereafter.

The ideal curriculum in literature, the curriculum which would provide both a method and a standard for considering experience both in literature and in life, would synthesize all three kinds of spirals: the tragic-comic spiral, the thematic spiral, and the formal spiral, the last two containing within themselves several subordinate spirals. If the organizational framework at several points is thematic, as I have suggested it very well may be, the selections chosen as illustrations of the theme and the methods suggested for the discussion of the selections will relate generic structures and craft to theme. If the organizational framework is based on form at other points, again the selections chosen and the methods of treating those selections will relate theme to structure and technique. Method can supply what is missing from the organization framework. Thus the primary concept of organic form can be taught continuously from the kindergarten on.

WHAT LANGUAGE CONCEPTS SHOULD WE TEACH TO FUTURE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH?

James M. McCrimmon, University of Illinois

In preparing these remarks I have made two preliminary assumptions. Since I am not a linguist nor a grammarian—traditional, structural, generative, or any other—I assume that my function here this afternoon is to consider the subject from the point of view of an English teacher—that is, a general practitioner in the teaching of English. I also assume that nobody really expects me, in twenty-five minutes or so, to discuss all the language concepts that a teacher of English must know and use, but that what is required is some exposition of those concepts that seem to me fundamental. I will not therefore try to be encyclopedic but will limit myself to three major sets of concepts: those that concern the teacher's overview of his subject, those that express the relation of language to experience, and those that have to do with grammar.

I think that the most important thing we can do for any young teacher is to give him a concept of his subject as a whole, by means of which he may integrate the various topics he will deal with in the classroom. Many English teachers lack a sense of coherence in their work; they teach units of subject matter rather than a subject, and they are often so preoccupied with these units that they do not make clear to their students or, even worse, to themselves the fundamental unity which presumably underlies these studies. Even those who pretend to some sophistication in the subject still find themselves at institutes, conferences, and conventions speaking, not about English, but about language, literature, and composition. Like Caesar, we divide the area into three parts and then find the divisions so convenient that we assume that God must have made them. Our lack of a sense of the unity of English leaves us with no clearly defined criterion for adding or discarding subject matter. Little wonder that Issue Number 1 in the *Report on Basic Issues in the Teaching of English* was the question, "What is English?"

What is English? What is its essence? Wherein lies its discipline? In the absence of any official answer to such questions, each of us must answer for himself. For me the answer lies in the relationship between form and meaning. The study of English, as I see it, is the study of the relation between symbolic structures and response to these structures. Stated more simply, it is the study of the relation between form and meaning in English statements, whether the statements are expressed in a sentence or a volume, and whether we approach the study from the concerns of a writer or a reader. As writers we are trying to shape our thoughts into a structure that will be meaningful to others; as readers we are trying to interpret the structures we encounter. These structures may be as simple as inflections for number or case, or they may be as complex as a tragedy or an epic. They may be written or spoken, read or heard; but always they have this in common: they are purposeful organizations of symbols from which we infer meaning.

Whether this answer is accepted or some other, I think that young teachers should be given an answer or be encouraged to find one; for some answer is necessary to bind together the disparate elements of an English course, and to keep the teacher from becoming, like Carlyle's Teufelsdröckh, a professor of things in general. There will be many things that the young English teacher can afford *not* to know, but surely he must know what his subject is; and it cannot be a collection of things; it cannot be a miscellany; it cannot be the science of things in general. If we are wondering what to teach our young teacher, I suggest we could begin with a concept of language as a means of sharing experience through the proper arrangement of symbols. Such a concept, when fully explored, would relate for him grammar, composition, and literature as they are not now related for him.

The second concept I would urge is the relation between language and experience, and here I do not mean simply the assertion that words are not things but symbols of things. Rather I mean the whole symbolic process by which we abstract and classify experience into concepts to which we give names. Whether, as Whorf has told us, our perceptions of reality are shaped by our language, certainly we interpret reality through language and we are constantly susceptible to confusing the two. Because we grow up in a language, it seems so natural to us that we forget how wonderfully artificial it is. The young teacher should at least know—though in moments of stress or sleepiness he will often forget—that language superimposes on reality a unity and permanence that are linguistic illusions.

An understanding of what is involved in classification and of the abstract and limited nature of class names will be important to him and his students in all kinds of intellectual activity. When I was a child I learned that all nouns were divided into three classes called "common," "abstract," and "proper" nouns. It would be hard to invent a system of classification that so confused the situation. Some nouns, it is true, are more abstract than others, at least in certain contexts, but all nouns are necessarily abstract, as are all other parts of speech. We may make the nouns more concrete by modification, but the words "abstract" and "concrete" denote relative degrees of abstraction. The young teacher we are concerned with must understand the abstract nature of language and pass on this understanding to his students, because only by this understanding can they escape the superstitions and the fallacies that ignorance of the word-thing relation invites.

There are other concepts in semantics which our teacher must know, though none so fundamental as the one I have mentioned. He should distinguish between denotations and connotations and between informative and affective statements in order to achieve a measure of control over the responses he himself makes and those he provokes in others. Most of all, his study of semantics should make him sensitive to the part that context plays in interpretation. What is required here is not just the crude observation that the meanings of words vary with their contexts, but the disciplined habit of close examination of a statement for clues which will reveal its implications. This habit is necessary to him and to his students in any interpretation of literature. A discovery of the

interrelation of context and connotation is often an act of creative interpretation in reading and writing. It would be folly for an English teacher to ignore that relation or to slight it while in pursuit of the less significant. The predisposition to make such discoveries ought to be built into the lesson plan so that it may be built into the student; and we should so instruct our young teacher.

In contrast to the overattention to grammar in our schools, the slighting of any serious work in semantics seems to me a sad thing. The interpretation of literature and effective speaking and writing, even clear thinking, are more often weakened by faulty semantics than by faulty grammar, and the consequences of semantic errors are vastly more serious than the consequences of grammatical errors. It seems therefore a very shortsighted policy to act as though the need for a study of language is satisfied by a study of grammar. I wonder if the reason for this disproportionate emphasis in the schools is that parents are more concerned that their children should speak correctly than that they should think correctly.

The third set of concepts with which I am concerned may be called "grammar." Generally these concepts have to do with morphological, syntactic, and intonational patterns in a sentence; but because my time is short, I am going to restrict what I have to say about grammar chiefly to syntax.

The first thing that our young teacher should know is that there is a significant difference between grammar and usage. Grammar is a system for analyzing the components of a sentence. It is descriptive. It tells us nothing about how the language *should* be used; it tries to tell us all it can about how language *is* used. Usage, by contrast, is concerned with how language *should* be used. It is prescriptive. It is concerned with establishing norms, and many of these norms have nothing to do with grammatical constructions but are concerned with such things as spelling, punctuation, pronunciation, and the mechanics of capitalization and hyphenation. In a society which is committed to a preference for a particular social dialect, standard English, the schools are necessarily concerned with usage; but the distinction between usage and grammar is not clearly understood by the public, which consequently spends large sums of money for the study of grammar on the assumption that it will help their children to speak and write "correctly."

Grammarians are sometimes scornful about attention to usage, chiefly because very often the norms that are advocated do not reflect the speech practices of educated people. Many constructions which have been standard usage for generations are condemned by teachers and parents who habitually use these constructions themselves; and this practice is sometimes supported by dictionaries, which—because of the time lag between the recognition of an established usage and its report in a dictionary—are necessarily behind the pace of an ever changing language. This situation, supplemented by public attitudes which are often less tolerant of linguistic immorality than of other kinds, sometimes makes it difficult for a conscientious lexicographer to tell the truth about usage, as witness the attacks on Webster's *Third International*.

Returning now to the topic of grammar, we encounter a problem of which grammar to choose. Basically our choice lies between the old (traditional)

grammar and two new grammars—structural and generative or transformational grammar. Traditional grammar is the kind we grew up with, and which our ancestors have studied for upwards of 200 years. It is the grammar still being taught by more than 90 percent of English teachers. For most people the names "traditional grammar" and "English grammar" are synonyms.

Structural grammar is chiefly a development of the last thirty years, and its most commonly recognized sources are the writings of Leonard Bloomfield, C. C. Fries, Bernard Bloch, George Trager, and Henry Lee Smith. Its method of analysis is to recognize structures of sound, form, and order, and to generalize these structures into patterns. This grammar has considerable prestige in such organizations as the National Council of Teachers of English and has recently found increasing acceptance in the schools, where it is often called the linguistic approach to grammar.

Generative or transformational grammar, as it is revealed in the writings of Chomsky, Harris, Lees, Stockwell, and others, attempts to describe, with a precision often resembling mathematical formulae, the ways in which new sentences are generated from basic or "kernel" sentences. Since this grammar is less than ten years old, it has not yet had time to make an impact in the schools; but it has been received with considerable enthusiasm at conventions of the National Council of Teachers of English, and some distinguished teachers see great promise for its applications, especially in composition.

The question as to which of these grammars the future teacher will use is one that can be better answered in the future than it can be now. No one of these grammars is entirely satisfactory, though all of them are useful. The definitions of traditional grammar are notoriously bad, but if the definitions are revised, the traditional approach—whatever its theoretical shortcomings—is still operationally profitable. It is certainly not nearly so confused as the structural grammarians have tried to make it seem. The structural approach is especially useful whenever the structures are clear but much less useful when the structures are not clear, as they are not for modification, and its logic is sometimes not so rigorous as its propaganda promised. Generative grammar is still too new and incomplete to be taken as the single tool for grammatical analysis.

The situation with respect to grammar is what the war communiqués used to describe as "fluid." Increasingly there is a feeling within the profession that we are on the way to a better grammar but have not yet got there. Professor Sledd has suggested that the best solution for the present is a transitional grammar that will move in the direction of the new grammar without renouncing all of the traditional grammar, and I have found this procedure an effective and time saving one in junior high schools. I think the best advice that we can give to our young teacher at this time is the advice that Professor Hook gave in an article in the *Illinois English Bulletin* of last December—to become acquainted with all systems and to select for particular purposes the most useful features of each system. This relativism may not always be comfortable, but I suspect that it will be less disturbing to young teachers than to older ones. At any rate, the future teachers might as well learn that, as Sapir once said, *All*

grammars leak. One way to keep dry is to change boats whenever the leaks become excessive.

One of the questions that the young teacher should consider is how much emphasis he is going to give the study of grammar, and in what grades. The answer depends, at least in part, on why he is teaching grammar at all. But whatever the reason, there seems to be no justification for the amount of time now devoted to grammar in the elementary and secondary schools. If we exclude problems of usage, which will be with us in all grades though not in all students, the practice of teaching grammar part of each year for upwards of eight years seems to me excessive, especially when we recognize that students have had six years of intensive experience with the language before entering the first grade. English grammar just isn't that difficult. Most of what is now being done in the elementary and senior high school curricula could be completed in the junior high school without loss of performance, if we eliminated the repetitions, the made work, the excessive terminology, and the overattention to unprofitable details, and if we planned the work in more efficient sequence.

If our young teacher raises the question of why he should teach grammar at all, he may be given two answers. One is that a knowledge of grammar helps to lay a foundation for better communication and that the study of grammar will result in improvement of a student's written and spoken composition. This is the majority position. The minority view is that since there is no satisfactory evidence that the study of grammar improves the student's ability to communicate, we can justify the teaching of grammar only for its value as general education. There are difficulties with both answers. I shall consider the second one first.

If the study of grammar is valuable chiefly as general education, by what criteria do we decide that grammar should have precedence over other general education subjects, say astronomy or civics? And how do we justify the selection of one general education subject for repeated attention in almost every year of the junior and senior high school curricula? It seems to me that the logic of the general education argument would lead to making grammar an elective course in the schools, like art or music, or to confining it to a single year, like American history. In the light of increasing costs of education and the popularity of accelerated programs, it is reasonable to doubt that either the school authorities or the public would continue the present support of grammar solely as a general education subject.

On the other hand, it is true that there is no satisfactory evidence that the teaching of grammar does improve communication. There are two reasons why the absence of such evidence does not impress me as being decisive. First, we do not at present have any reliable, objective means of measuring improvement in writing; so how could we tell in any way that would be statistically respectable whether student writing had improved or not, with or without the study of grammar? Second, as it is generally taught, the work in grammar usually stops short of any transfer to writing. It is chiefly concerned with learning the metalanguage, with identifying and naming the parts of speech and the components of a sentence and thus acquiring a vocabulary for talking about language.

One would not expect that kind of accomplishment to have an obvious effect on writing proficiency. But if the work were carried beyond the naming of the parts to the effects achieved by manipulating the structures within a sentence and to the generation of new sentences from recognized patterns—whether done by traditional or generative methods—then one would expect to find some transfer to writing. Indeed, at that stage, the study of grammar becomes indistinguishable from composition.

The purpose of the study of grammar, in my opinion, is to improve communication by considering the ways in which ideas may be structured within a sentence, and I think grammar ought to be taught with that intent. If it is so taught, and if the evaluation instrument is designed to test the ability to structure ideas into a sentence, then I am confident that the relationship between grammar and writing can be established. If it cannot, we ought to reconsider the whole attention to grammar in the schools.

It will be obvious from what I have said that the grammatical concepts that I would stress are those which would be most likely to improve communication. For this interest, the chief concepts are those which permit us to explore the relation between logical and grammatical emphasis, or between the structure of thought and the structure of statement. I would emphasize especially coordination, subordination, order, and modification. But to teach these concepts efficiently the teacher would need some simple machinery—the basic sentence elements: subject, verb, object, modifier, connective, phrase, subordinate clause, and main clause. With these tools he could carry out useful analyses of sentences. But I think he would be well-advised to keep the analysis simple. The most useful structures are the phrase and the clause. The procedure of analyzing every word in a sentence—whether we call it parsing, sentence diagraming, or identifying the immediate constituents—is, in my opinion, unnecessary, unprofitable, and time wasting. The purpose of analysis is to discover the relation of form and thought, not to anatomize the sentence.

At the risk of boring you with my theme I am going to repeat my conviction that it is this relation of form and thought, of structure and meaning, that is the main business of the English teacher, regardless of the kind of communication he is working with at the moment. I am tempted to say that English has no true subject apart from this relationship, that in grammar, in an essay, in a short story, in a poem—especially in a poem—a fuller understanding of this relationship is basic to our concern with the material. It may be, as in this meeting, convenient to discuss the subject of English from the points of view of language, literature, and composition, but we must be careful to see that the subject does not get defined and thus limited by the point of view. It is in constant danger of being so defined and so limited, because it is easier to take things apart than to put them together again. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the study of grammar, which may in the classroom become all analysis and no synthesis and may nullify its purpose through a preoccupation with the particles of speech. Perhaps one thing we should do for our future teacher is to so inoculate him that he will be allergic to fragmentation.

These, then, are the concepts that I would advocate as the minimum essentials

for the future teacher in the area of language. I would have him, first of all, get above his subject and see it as a unified whole, a Gestalt, so that the particular and impromptu judgments that he will have to make in the classroom may proceed out of a philosophy of language and not be simply a collection of *ad hoc* decisions. I would have him understand that the purpose of language is to interpret and communicate experience and that therefore he should be aware of what is involved when we verbalize experience; and I would want him sensitive to the connotations of words in particular contexts. I would have him see the grammar of his language as a system for communicating information, ideas, and attitudes. And I would hope that he had enough sense of proportion not to allow the study of the system to become an end in itself.

To these I would add one final concept which is not restricted to language. The young teacher needs an image of his profession and of himself as a professional. Let me explain that briefly.

Great changes have taken place in the teaching of English in the last generation, and it is inevitable that still greater changes will occur in the next. When I first started to teach, the linguists, with a few conspicuous exceptions, such as Professor Fries, showed no interest in the teaching of English at any level below the graduate level. Today they are competing with each other to write textbooks, or to inspire textbooks, which will bring the results of their work into the schools at all grade levels. Similar contributions are being made by specialists in semantics, literature, psychology, and other areas, and all this makes for an impressive professional growth in the teaching of English. The young teacher must envisage himself as sharing that growth. If he is going to find a maximum sense of fulfillment in teaching, he must project himself into the future development of his profession and grow with it. If he wants to be a part of a cooperative effort that is moving in the direction of weaving the discrete elements of English into an integrated discipline, the opportunity will be open to him. Perhaps, in the long run, that image of an English teacher is the best concept we can teach him.

METHODS OF INQUIRY

Morris Finder, Western Washington State College

With new school programs a topic of everyday conversation, the public is ready to accept a sound, new curriculum in English. Here, such a term as "new school programs" means, roughly, school learning that conforms to tenets of scholarship, especially to those tenets concerning structure of disciplines and methods of inquiry. For example, in some older programs, literature was used in units on such topics as Eskimos and immigrants. Often the use of literature in these topical units was mainly to provide information about Eskimos and immigrants and to improve skills of reading. However valuable, such activity is hardly literary. On the other hand, a work of literature in newer programs is used to teach pupils how to read literature as literature and how to use methods of inquiry appropriate to literary study.

Some barriers to newer programs derive not from public reaction but, oddly, from those professionally concerned with the teaching of English. Usually the opposition is not mere hostility to the new, but comes from failure to understand and to be convinced that the newer ends and means are desirable and feasible. A typical reaction to programs based on the newer ideas holds these to be impractical, unreal, unnecessary, or too radical. Practicality and reality are thus associated with the familiar, with the solving of everyday problems. But there is no necessary relation between the unfamiliar on the one hand and the practical, the desirable, and the necessary on the other. This paper, therefore, first suggests the desirability of these newer kinds of programs and then identifies and examines some barriers and problems that hinder their fulfillment.

The term "methods of inquiry" refers to procedures—with or without pedagogical adaptation—that specialists in a field of knowledge use professionally. Each subject field—history, zoology, linguistics, rhetoric, and so on—has evolved unique methods for investigating distinctive kinds of problems and objects. The use of such investigative methods is one characteristic of activity in a discipline.

Whether in advanced study or in school learning, investigative method characteristically is not taught as an isolated aspect of content. Usually the student of a discipline learns to use and to understand the methods through such activities as these: (1) learning the presuppositions of the field, (2) seeking answers to questions relevant to a given area of inquiry, (3) understanding relevant concepts and using terminology that names the concepts, (4) solving problems according to accepted procedure, and (5) working within the limits and facing up to the difficulties imposed by the field. In this paper such terms as "appropriate inquiry" and "relevant inquiry" are synonymous with "methods of inquiry," just defined.

There are at least three reasons for concern with methods of inquiry in school learning. The study of investigative method increases interest in a subject, enables the learner to acquire the best available ways of thinking about it, and provides a basis for his continuing education after his school-going days.

The term "structure of disciplines" refers to sets of those concepts or gen-

eralizations that, once understood, explain many specific facts. For example, the concept of the phoneme in some methods of linguistic study may be used to explain several facts concerning language. An understanding of that concept helps one know why his native language sounds familiar to him while the speech of a language unknown to him sounds like a meaningless jumble. Also, such understanding helps him know why a speaker of one language tends not to hear sounds that are important in another. Similarly, an adequately formulated concept of plot is useful in his thinking about many works of literature.

Perhaps the main reason for structure of disciplines in school learning is that the accumulation of knowledge is so vast that coverage (if it ever was feasible) is now impossible. Therefore, an understanding of the concepts basic to the discipline gives the learner a way of explaining, organizing, and thinking about much specific fact and detail.

In the field of English, a distinguishing feature of the newer curriculum is that ideally it encourages the pupil to make firsthand and appropriate inquiry into important kinds of knowledge—into language, into works of literature, and into the processes of composition. For a teacher to guide such learning, he needs training in the relevant disciplines. Specifically, it is necessary that his training in language be guided by those who are themselves specifically trained in methods of literary criticism; and in composition, by those knowledgeable in rhetoric and in the practical problems of constructing oral and written discourse.

Such training is intended to give the teacher control of investigative methods in three areas of English. In addition, he requires control of an investigative method in planning and teaching, a fourth aspect of the teaching of English. That method gives him procedures for thinking rationally and systematically about the crucial aspects of instruction. Helping the teacher inquire into these four aspects of the teaching of English may well be a new objective in the education of teachers.

An examination of these areas of inquiry reveals some problems and barriers that face those who would develop this newer program. Because language study is the least familiar and the least understood aspect of English teaching, it receives emphasis in this discussion.

Literature

The teaching of literature as appropriate inquiry into literary works is based partly on an explicit and defensible idea of what literature is. For the nature of literature is an important basis from which to derive objectives proper for literary study and to derive learning activities for reaching those objectives. The field of literary criticism is the source of information on the nature of literature and on methods proper to literary study.

A view of literature based on the best available literary criticism provides the teacher with one important basis for making selections for his group, asking the right questions, constructing valid examinations, and carrying on in relevant and coherent fashion all other classroom work in literature. Thus, a teacher's understanding of a system of criticism can help to make the study of "Stopping by Woods . . ." in the third period English class less a session in free association

and more a session in systematic, sensitive, and relevant inquiry into the poem.

The suggestion that the teaching of literature be informed by an appropriate discipline often meets with negative response—with the contention that disciplined study "spoils" literature for pupils and "takes the joy out of it." While there has obviously been much misuse of critical method in teaching, a failure in pedagogy does not imply that disciplined literary study is therefore unfeasible. Nor is there antithesis between sensitivity of response and properly rigorous inquiry. Such inquiry offers its own pleasure.

Discovering ways to adapt systems of criticism and other investigative methods to the capacities of pupils is a much needed kind of research that is suited to the field of English education. The failure of schools to treat literature as a systematic and genuinely literary study is a failure both in scholarship and in pedagogy. For there has been failure to identify the appropriate scholarship in criticism and to adapt that scholarship to the experiences of pupils.

Composition and Language Study

In the American English-teaching culture, composition and language study are often confused, thought of as the same thing, or thought of as two aspects of the same thing. Discussing composition and language study together makes it convenient to suggest that the two are different. As mentioned, most of this discussion concerns language study, the least familiar component of the curriculum.

A difference between language study and composition is that composition needs no justification in the curriculum but language study does. One condition that hinders acceptance of the idea that schools should teach what language and English are is the American English-teaching culture, which characteristically holds narrowly practical views about what the English curriculum should be. From my discussions with teachers and others actively concerned with English teaching, I have inferred that English is commonly viewed as a mere skill building program; that any study of grammar and language unlikely to improve practical communication skills is a waste of the school's resources; that learners in English classes should be innocent about the nature of language and the structure of English, but those same learners in the science class should be informed about the nature of clouds and the structure of plants.

Our everyday experience also hinders development of programs in which language phenomena are the objects of inquiry. For example, Bloomfield noted that people can talk about writing because they have learned to write under explicit verbal instruction, but they have not learned to talk about speech or language because they learned to talk without specific verbal teaching.[1] Because people have not learned to think and talk about language, and because of conventional views of the aims of English, the typical citizen as well as the typical educator understandably finds the notion of linguistic knowledge as school learning strange and unfamiliar. A typical discussion of the aims of language study almost always drifts off into a discussion of usage or of composition. Not

[1] Leonard Bloomfield, *Linguistic Aspects of Science* ["International Encyclopedia of Unified Science," Vol. I, No. 4] (Chicago: The University Press, 1939), p. 7.

only does that reaction indicate the unfamiliarity of linguistic content; it indicates the narrowly practical emphasis of English teaching in our culture.

Although no other single aspect of the environment is more intimate and pervasive than language, ignorance and misconception about it prevail. If the purpose of the school is to help people understand what the world is like, then this prevailing ignorance implies an educational need. As indicated, filling such a need requires first, an emphasis on disciplines and inquiry in the education of teachers, and second, an overcoming of narrow views of English teaching.

A third problem concerns the dearth of instructional materials. Right materials for language study must be informed by the state of man's linguistic knowledge. Of course, in this respect language study is no different from the other components of English, for these, too, need materials that embody the best scholarly content.

One attack that may be made on the problem could be adaptations of papers that have been written by linguists. The adaptation, of course, must be in terms comprehensible to learners. Although adaptations of literary works may be undesirable, there seems no reason to fear sound simplification of linguistic papers as a basis for a scientific kind of inquiry. So far as I know, this idea hasn't been extensively tried, but a suggestion for this kind of material in the teaching of science is under serious consideration.[2]

The term "integration" suggests a fourth problem. The preceding discussion suggests that language study has its own objects and methods of inquiry. Briefly, the nature of language and the structure of English are examples of the objects of linguistic inquiry. The methods, of course, are those of the descriptive linguist.

Composition, on the other hand, has its distinctive objects and methods of inquiry. Its objects are spoken and written discourse, and its methods derive from those of the rhetorician and the practicing writer.

Similarly, the objects of literary study are works of poetry, drama, and fiction, and the literary critic is the primary acceptable source of methods for studying those works.

Thus, literature, language study, and composition are different. Each has its own objects of inquiry and its own methods of inquiry. Each is properly concerned with developing in the pupil a range of learning that is appropriate to its subject matter and to its investigative method.

If the aim is to teach structure of disciplines and methods of inquiry, such teaching necessarily implies a separation of the disciplines. For a method of inquiry can be used only for the purposes for which it was evolved. A method of literary criticism can be used only to study those objects and to find answers to those questions that a given system of criticism addresses. A rhetorical method is appropriate only to the problems of constructing and understanding discourses of persuasion. A linguistic method cannot be used to study literature itself, nor can a rhetorical method be used to investigate English structure.

Efforts to escape these necessary and valuable differences by attempting to

[2] Joseph J. Schwab, "The Teaching of Science as Enquiry," *The Teaching of Science* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 73–87.

fuse or to integrate these three components of English into a single entity mislead the learner by perpetuating his innocence of the nature of knowledge and of investigative method.

A common assertion relevant to these comments is that the third period English class would go better if topics in composition were drawn from study in language or literature. The popularity of such proposals justifies further comment.

A student's composition on *Huckleberry Finn* may be considered an exercise in composition, in literature, or in both. In teaching, it is often necessary to emphasize, and in assigning work it is indispensable for the teacher to know what learning or behavior the pupil is expected to acquire as a result of his doing that work. With literature emphasized, the learner's doing a paper on *Huckleberry Finn* may be appropriate. But with composition emphasized, his doing a paper on a literary topic may not be adequately helpful. Our everyday experience indicates that, other things the same, the learner is likely to do well with a composition to the extent that he is interested in his topic. A topic really interesting to him may very well *not* be one in literature, and it may very well *not* be one in language. Because of the varied interests that pupils have, the aims of composition will probably not be best served by limiting topics for exposition to the fields of language and literature. Although the composition on *Huckleberry Finn* may be an attempt to kill two birds with one stone, we *may* kill the literary bird, but the bird of composition may fly away.

It is one thing to recognize that composition, language, and literature are different, and another to recognize that the communication skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening necessarily are part of English and of other parts of the school's curriculum. Because the communication skills are used, there is ample opportunity for guiding pupils in their use. I find it useful, therefore, to distinguish between writing and speaking on the one hand and oral and written composition on the other. Writing and speaking occur continuously in the school and pupils may receive appropriate guidance in using those skills. But such guidance may not be the main concern. Oral and written composition is that part of English in which such knowledge and skill receive primary, specific, and systematic instruction. The distinction is a recognition of an obvious but valuable reality of the classroom in English.

Another argument asserts that study of English syntactic patterns makes it likely that pupils will use those patterns in their compositions. That argument, too, is hard to defend.

First, a study of structural or generative grammar typically does not get beyond the baby sentence. Inquiry into a structural grammar necessarily involves phonology (segmental and suprasegmental) and morphology. Usually the study of syntax is limited to quite simple structures. In one method of analysis, important aspects of sentences—modification, transitive, direct object, and others—cannot be dealt with at the level of syntax, but require a higher (but not yet developed) level of analysis that may be called semology or discourse

analysis.[3] Second, the examples in a study of English structure are characteristically not from writing but from speech. There are, of course, real differences between the discourse of speech and the discourse of writing. Third, methods and objects proper to linguistic study are different from the methods and problems of constructing oral and written discourse. An examination of any list of faults in composition will show that these rarely fall into the province of linguistic study, but usually concern usage, relations of author and discourse to audience, conventions of the writing system, clarity of statement, and the like—matters which typically do not concern the linguist as linguist.

Generative grammar is a younger infant than structural, and its typical study is still at the level of the baby sentence—phrase structure sentences and simple transformations. This elemental state of linguistic descriptions of English is not a failure of the linguist, but reflects his going in new directions. For the job of a real linguist is not primarily to serve the needs of schools but to analyze and describe languages and to devise improved methods for doing his work. If the school intends to teach what language and English are, its primary, acceptable source of information is the field of linguistics, and it must make appropriate selections of content from that field and use that content as one basis for selecting objectives. The nature of linguistic content suggests that it cannot be extensively used in the teaching of composition. The study of phonology and morphology, for example, is not the study relevant to the construction of discourse.

Writing and speech are different, and the kind of discourse to be read is the kind of discourse to be written. Therefore, a defensible transition to writing is not from speech or from grammatical study but from reading and study of the kinds of writing the learner is expected to do. More than one teacher has observed that pupils learn unconsciously to write the kind of discourse they read.

Selecting a grammar to teach is a fifth problem. A grammar as a grammar is valuable in proportion to the adequacy and clarity of its description of language. It is commonly held that that grammar is best which is most likely to improve composition. Of course, one must know the purpose one has for teaching anything. But, as mentioned, it is arguable whether awareness of English structure is a key to composition.

If the aim is to develop an understanding of how language works, then obviously a grammar must be selected, and the criterion should be its effectiveness in showing the learner how his language works. A structural grammar may help him see English as a system of formal signs that conveys meaning; and a generative grammar, as a device consisting of a finite set of ordered rules with an unlimited output of grammatical sentences. Each of these grammars reveals English from a different conceptual structure, and each offers a contribution to the education of pupils.

A sixth problem in teaching language is unlearning. Usually teachers are concerned with increasing knowledge, developing skills, and the like. But in teaching linguistic knowledge, there is a problem of helping pupils unlearn

[3] Henry Lee Smith, Jr., "The Teacher and the World of English," *English Journal*, XLVII (April, 1958), 188.

ideas that are mistaken but are inevitably acquired from everyday living. I refer to the confusion of language and writing, to such folklore as the supposed precision of the French language, the so-called crudeness of Hottentot, and the much believed corruption of English by the advertising industry. Because lay misconception interferes with the acquisition of linguistic knowledge, language study involves an unlearning process. We need to know, therefore, whether unlearning is best conceived as debunking, brainwashing, displacement, a judicious combination of these, or as something else.

A seventh problem concerns learning by discovery. My experience in teaching the structure of English suggests that not everything can be taught well, economically, and honestly through a discovery procedure.

For example, Trager and Smith tell us that English has four levels of stress; Chomsky, Halle, and Lukoff say that English has but two. If the aim is to provide the learner with an understanding of English stress, which of these or of other systems is he to "discover" for himself?

Obviously, pupils cannot be expected to discover and describe English stress for themselves. To make such discoveries requires technical training in phonetics, phonemics, and a trained ear. However, pupils can inquire into a systematic description of English stress.

It is reasonable for the teacher to begin his teaching of English stress by discussing and illustrating what stress is and what it does, then saying to his class something like this: "Different linguists have different descriptions of how the English stress system works. We are going to learn *one* of these descriptions." From that point, instruction may proceed in deductive fashion, meaningfully, honestly, and economically.

While there may be parts of the school curriculum which lend themselves to pupils' honestly making discoveries of knowledge worth having, much of the nature of language and much of the structure of English do not. Seasoned, competent linguists often can't agree whether a given syllable occurred under weak or tertiary stress. And living in our literate culture burdens the learner with almost insurmountable difficulty were he expected to discover for himself that language is by Sapir's definition purely human, noninstinctive, auditory, and the rest.

A conversation I had once with a specialist in inquiry procedures of teaching ironically gave some support to this assertion. In his explanation of how the nature of language could be taught through discovery procedures, that specialist came out with the usual collection of lay misconceptions about language. Of course, the study of language in school is intended to refute such misconceptions.

Curriculum Inquiry

In the pedagogical part of the teacher's education, the most important single element is the investigative method of the specialist in curriculum and instruction. That specialist is concerned with four kinds of problems: (1) deriving and formulating educational objectives, (2) selecting or devising activities that are intended to bring about the learning specified by the objectives, (3) organizing these activities to the end that they bring about a maximal cumulative effect

upon the learner, and (4) evaluating the activities by determining the extent to which pupils have acquired the kinds of learning that the objectives specify.

The teacher is likely to conduct an important, interesting, and rational program to the extent that he practices a method of inquiry appropriate to the activities of planning, teaching, and evaluating. Although there are teachers who do seem to have an intuitive sense of proper aims, activities, and the like, the teacher who has neither the talents I have just mentioned nor control of a method of curriculum inquiry typically conducts a classroom characterized by routine dullness, triviality, or plain chaos.

An instructional program that is not based on a soundly conceived curricular plan is like a structure made by carpenters, bricklayers, and plasterers who do things without a clear idea of why they are doing them. Since building tradesmen don't really work that way, we don't see fantastic results. But the social waste of ill-planned instructional programs does go on, for such waste is not apparent to casual observation.

There are striking similarities between the general lack of linguistic knowledge and the general lack of curricular knowledge. Because people haven't learned to think and talk about language, a typical discussion of language, as I indicated earlier, usually drifts off into a discussion of writing, or usage, or literature, or something else that people have learned to talk about. Similarly, a discussion of instructional objectives typically drifts off into a discussion of activities, or textbooks, or tests, or something else that people have learned to talk about.

Because the ends of an instructional program are basic, there can be no rational thinking and discussion of it until the ends are explicitly formulated and clearly understood. When adequately formulated, an objective specifies what patterns of thinking, aesthetic responses, and motor skills a learner is expected to acquire as a result of his taking part in a program of instruction. Statements of such objectives are criteria for selecting content, texts, methods, evaluation procedures, and the rest. For an instructional program is a means for attaining its objectives. Methods of curriculum inquiry can help teachers learn the concepts useful in thinking about instructional programs. Such understanding is a basis for productive thinking, planning, and teaching.

Further, methods of curriculum inquiry can help teachers embark on innovative projects in some systematic fashion. In classroom instruction there are four areas in which significant innovation can occur, and these are the areas into which curriculum inquiry is often divided. One is the possibility of different kinds of objectives. Another is different kinds of learning activities to serve objectives whether new or familiar. A third area of innovation concerns differences in the organization of learning activities. The fourth area is newer procedures of evaluation. There is always need for innovation in teaching, and there is increased likelihood of success when the innovator is able to see clearly a relation of his innovation to other parts of a school's program.

One aspect of innovation is the teacher's realizing the possibilities of creativity in his teaching. Often teachers find it productive to undertake original, creative work in conducting learning activities. For a learning activity is replaceable. That is, so long as the activity sets the learner to work at

appropriate practice of the behavior sought, that activity is sound procedure. Typically, a large number of procedures can be devised to serve any objective.

With such possibility of creative work, teachers need not become, nor need they be trained to become, mere users of textbooks, mere performers of the routine, or mere seekers after survival skills. With few exceptions, problems of discipline, problems of the school serving the slum dweller, and similar matters are essentially problems of curriculum. The curriculum specialist offers procedures for making systematic attack on such problems.

I cite three related publications as useful in helping teachers acquire this latter kind of investigative method. One is *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* by Ralph W. Tyler, currently director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences; a second is *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice* by Hilda Taba of San Francisco State College, and the third is *Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction* by Robert F. Mager of Varian Associates.[4] The two latter publications are obviously derived from the Tyler work, an inexpensive booklet that gives a brief but comprehensive treatment of what he calls a ". . . rationale by which to examine problems of curriculum and instruction."[5] Miss Taba's book is essentially an expansion of Tyler's booklet, and Mager's book, an inexpensive paperback, provides instruction in preparing explicit and useful statements of instructional objectives.

The investigative method of the specialist in curriculum and instruction is relevant to the methods course, for problems of teaching are essentially problems of objectives, of means to the attainment of these, and of the evaluation of both means and the achievement of pupils. The task of a methods course, therefore, is to help the teacher learn and use the best available procedures for inquiring into those problems. Although the realities of a classroom cannot be conveyed to the student in the methods class, he can learn in that class what the fundamental problems of teaching are and what methods can help him attack those problems. Realities of the classroom change from room to room, but no matter what the classroom, no matter what the level of schooling, objectives, activities, and evaluation remain the crucial problems of instruction.

To conclude: Newer curriculums in English are attempts to bring the methods and results of scholarship to the pupil in school. The programs require, first, teachers who have control of investigative methods in composition, linguistics, literature, and curriculum inquiry. They require, second, a change in narrowly practical views and in some traditional practices. And they require, third, materials that are informed by the best available scholarship. Attempts to fulfill the promise of the newer curriculum seem justified because they exploit rather fully the rich and important content of English.

---

[4] Ralph W. Tyler, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950).

Hilda Taba, *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice* (New York and Burlingame: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962).

Robert F. Mager, *Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction* (San Francisco: Fearon Publishers, 1962).

[5] Tyler, *op. cit.* p. 2.

A WAY OF PREPARING AN ENGLISH TEACHER

George H. Henry, University of Delaware

We in English education have been so preoccupied with exposing the scandalous condition of the preparation of English teachers, and then grabbing at the most expediently immediate means of upgrading teaching, that we have lost sight of the most fundamental weaknesses in the education of English teachers even in the best colleges. We have been creating no model curricula in teacher education in English to be striven for; we are in the main only juggling course credits and course titles. Improving teaching at present has meant chiefly team teaching, lay readers, programed learning, and linguistics, none of which has much of anything to do with the central issue: What kind of education is best to make a teacher-to-be know what it means to participate in a social undertaking like public education in a democracy? What should be the English teacher's particular competence, given the state of knowledge now prevailing? What makes him a fit person to be around adolescents in a constantly intimate spiritual relation? For instance, as much as I advocate the new grammars, I should much rather have a teacher who never attended an institute on the new grammar but knew what any grammar is for—to help get at the relation of language structure to thought structure and of thought to reality, so that the pupil might discern the movement from syntax to semantics to logic. And surely I should prefer an English teacher who knows his way around music and painting, yet has some gaps in a British survey, to one who knows his survey "evenly" but little about music and painting.

As for the English teacher's preparation in general education, I have never met an English department that did not have a contemptuous unconcern about the type and quality of the science the English major is receiving, as if science were on another planet instead of across the campus lawn and in the head of the prospective teacher in the English seminar; and yet here is the most disastrous cleavage in Western civilization, one that may very well be the doom of our culture. As if a course or two in science for the English major "satisfies" that area forever, courses often self-contained in manuals without a shred of vision! As if, in turn, a "service" course or two of English snippets can humanize the engineer! One would think that an English department would slug it out in the holy name of humanism to enlarge and recreate the science program for its English majors so that they be more fit to interpret literature itself. How can an English teacher-to-be understand Euripides without Heraclitus, Plato without Pythagoras, Shakespeare without the medieval cosmology, Milton on the brink of Galileo, Kepler, Newton; the physiocrats and the Age of Reason, Darwin and the Victorians, the new nominalism of science and ethical relativism in our novels, Freud and the decline of rational motivation in character analysis, Marx and the sociology of values, anthropology and language as in Sapir and Whorf? Without these, the fledgling English major looks to be out of touch with the deepest currents of the past centuries, out of intellectual rapport with the youth before him,

seventy percent of whom go into some form of science and for whom the literary imagination is something relegated to getting past college admissions.

A course in the philosophy of science may help make as good an English teacher as a course in the Age of Dryden or even a semester of American literature. What would certainly be better than either is someone who could do both these tasks in one! A biologist I know gives a course in Organic Evolution, in which he traces not only its antecedents and the various theories as to its nature, but its influence on other sciences, on religion, on literature, on economics, on politics, and on education. He necessarily brings in lecturers to help him do this. But no English majors take such a course, or are nudged into it by their advisers, or are required to do so, and yet I venture to claim that this would help them as much as the typical English course. An American studies course in the history department is often richer than an American literature course in the English department. What I am trying to get at is that a comprehensive view of general education is necessary if the idea of majoring in English itself is to be meaningful. In general education courses organized around themes and concepts, much of the literature of the world must be drawn upon, and thus literature is seen organically, that is, both in its cultural setting and in historical movement. The student may thus observe the way literary works reveal the mind of an age such as Queen Elizabeth's London or the Gaelic renaissance or the New Freedom culminating in President Wilson. Thus a good deal of literature need not be split up into English courses at all; in truth it should not be. That it now is is a curriculum catastrophe.

Actually, English is not a discipline of organic subject matter with its own inherent conceptual strands like many other disciplines; hence English literature courses can seldom rightfully be "service" courses within general education; but they may be the "life," so to speak, within the conceptual frame of general education. Literature does not create the seminal ideas, the thought structure, or the events of an age; rather, it takes these and moulds them into an empathic experience called interpretation. Literature (not literature courses) being the bearer of the humanistic interpretation of events, persons, and values—all of these elements organically conceived within an art "form"—must of course comprise the bulk of the content of general education, but English cannot contribute a principle of organization to general education. Courses like Great Writers, Great Dramatists, and very often a History of American Literature are really not courses at all unless they discover a theme of organization outside themselves. That is why English courses as service courses in general education are often unsuitable. Such courses permit a free-wheeling of ideas, literary chitchat of quotations out of context from works of art of all climes, references abstracted from the dynamic pattern of different epochs millennia apart. If subject matter means the logical invention of a structure of ideas to develop a concept, then it may be said that English courses have content but rarely a subject matter. When majors take in succession courses like Victorian poetry, Greek drama, the early novel, the contemporary lyric, one wonders what these can add up to. The content of these courses might be more effectively taught within cultural history, or cultural anthropology, or like such a course at Har-

vard that studies "tensions between man's ideals and the realities of his existence, between his sense of achievement and his sense of failure."

General education thus gives majoring a direction, while, in turn, majoring brings vitality to the legitimately abstract values structuring general education. Paradoxically, majoring abstracts from a totality of outlook a small portion of knowledge that it may be more intimately and concretely perceived. Majoring looks at the literary work of art as art: how art is able to hold life. It observes how art keeps alive the ever present conflict between the thrust of social force and the drive of inner motive. Majoring in English thus confronts the teacher as existential person with the social heritage; it makes explicit by formal literary means what he as person may have absorbed unconsciously. We might say, with Robert Spiller, that majoring aims to analyze "the creative process as a living act" and "the work of art as fresh experience." If majoring were understood in this way, some professional education courses could be embedded inside general education and others within the major itself, just as perhaps half the miscellany of English courses could be absorbed into general education.

GENERAL EDUCATION OF THE ENGLISH TEACHER

At the highest abstract level general education should yield a set of three ultimate insights. This trinity, according to Herman Randall in "The Unity of Knowledge," becomes:

1) understanding the various visions that man has had of the good life and how men have participated in them (music, painting, poetry, etc.)
2) understanding what these visions mean, a relating of these visions to one another (literature in various languages, anthropology, philosophy, and history)
3) understanding how the visions are seen and how the seeing of them is brought about (science, the social studies, psychology)

This trinity is, in brief, a revelation of the possibilities before man, or, as William James stated it, "to know the chief rival attitudes toward life."

This trinity looks to be but the familiar form that general education has been taking—the three divisions called the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences, somewhat like The Harvard Report (1945). Taking a number of courses in such arbitrary divisions, however, will not yield these three insights. A teacher who is to teach English should come to see by his senior year that this very logical analysis of knowledge into courses, departments, and divisions, itself accounts for some of man's deepest woes, especially if to be human means "to see life steadily and to see it whole." As Whitehead points out, our very curriculum distorts reality. This tension along the boundaries of the divisions and departments, the future teacher of English should come to see, helps define the human condition: the seeming inability of thought to capture the existential man. This quest, the teacher should come to see, provides the eternal drive of liberal education.

This tension along the boundaries of the conventional divisions of knowledge is due to more than the embarrassing overlapping of career walls, on the one hand, or to their arbitrary, institutional separation on the other; this tension reveals also the inability of thought, as now organized into a college curriculum, to deal with the explosion of knowledge. The future teacher should behold that

today the self sems unable to imbibe its own created knowledge, yet there can be no adequate self without a heritage of knowledge. Bringing the self and the fruits of reason into alignment is the meaning of liberal education in the curriculum sense. If the English major as teacher does not see this tension, he misses all. He does not know why he is being taught in a particular way, and he does not know, therefore, *why* he is going soon to teach the way he expects to. If he does feel this tension, he would then know why English has so little articulation, little unity, many "inartistic" courses (without beginning or end).

These broken divisions of the college curriculum represent really a cleavage between the heritage, the self, and existence. Man is part of the heritage, for his humanity is not "given," yet he ever hopes to find how much belongs to self (freedom) and how much to the social matrix that allows him to exist (authority). And in this quest the self is free to look upon its own existence—esteem it or despise it. Thus the very logic that tells us that we must divide knowledge in order to make a workable curriculum warns us that in doing so we are distorting "reality," the reality we live by and the reality of what it is we hope to teach. The purpose of general education can thus be defined as a search for the appropriate content from the vast knowledge at our disposal, and the best means of organizing it for achieving the aims of liberal education. General education should thus allow the future teacher to stand outside and apart from the convention called English, to discover what English is as an entity, and might be.

The student should be carefully led to study the immemorial cleavages in man's knowledge, how certain societies and certain epochs have bridged them to their satisfaction and warred over them to their sorrow; and how these cleavages have been variously conceived and modified and why. The ideal product of general education should have pondered long on how conjunctive the "and" is in these relations—God and man, man and nature, nation and humanity, mind and body, virtue and knowledge, freedom and authority, the conscious and the unconscious. The student should know where in our day attempts are made to pierce these discontinuities (biochemistry, social psychology) and where the fissures are widening (the humanities and science, if C. P. Snow be correct).

The Flow of Ideas

A study of the movement of ideas through time, such as suggested by Whitehead's *Adventure of Ideas*, is a necessary part of general education for the English teacher. How concepts as battle cries have instigated revolutions, survived revolutions, been regarded as now transcendental and then diabolical, have permeated an age, have reversed their meaning, fallen into colorless household words, then phoenix-like, have risen afresh—such ideas as fate, faith, romanticism, liberalism, classicism, progress, humanism, freedom, natural rights, sin. This kind of course has usually been parceled out to history departments, which, department-like, have often debased it into "straight history."

Comparing Cultures

One of the most fruitful modes of general education is the study of some culture other than one's own as an organic entity—not just its literature or its

religion or its art or its history, but all of them as illustrative of its peculiar "strain of consistency," its unique view of life, its cyclic movement from archaic to late flowering. It represents an anthropological view of a whole people plus an interpretation, much like Bowra's *Greek Experience* or Gilbert Murray's study. This was the view of humanism of the early Renaissance that would have avidly absorbed, if it could, the *whole* Greek outlook whether agriculture, shipping, an ode, or a symposium. The method is at its richest when two cultures are contrasted and compared, one being our own, in the way Meiklejohn has long advocated. It can be done through the study of a foreign language if carefully planned, but most foreign language departments lose sight of their goal, even with advanced students, by becoming immersed in the language only or a preoccupation with literature only. Central to this kind of study should be the relation of culture to personality, as Riesman did this sort of course at Chicago, using Benedict's *Patterns of Culture* and Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents* as its groundwork. Included in such a study would be the interplay of cultural disintegration and the instability of the self.

A Study of the Contemporary

Where general education has failed—that is, become vacuously sweeping or superficial—it has not been balanced or supported by studies of how specific problems are embedded in values and visions of life and of how personal human decision is made in the welter of conflicting trends and historical forces. As part of general education, therefore, there should be a study of what Sidney Hook calls the basic cultural phenomena of our time, and along with it there should be a study of the unique man carrying within him the full burden of the forces and conflicts of his age and his wrestling to resolve these into a choice for good or evil for himself and others. The first quest becomes an impersonal diagnosis of a live situation; the second is the pupil's empathic response to a human life immersed in forces beyond its control. A student at Yale comments on the "Challenge" movement there in this way, "Our concern and sensitivity have become intellectualized and sophisticated to the point where we are unable to respond creatively to those social issues which are so complex that they seem remote."

The first part of such a "course" would thus identify and select certain contemporary problems or issues. Here would be placed the present ideological struggle, "an inquiry into our technological age, its approximate causes, its continuing traditions, and its intimations for the future." Superorganization, racial strife, the conduct of public education, mass production of goods and ideas, the meaning of abundance, secularization, the exploding metropolis, decline of local government, pressure groups, control of nuclear energy, community disorganization. An important part of the subject matter of this course, the most severe cleavages of our time, would be the wide difference between the political and the literary imaginations. To come to such an understanding, the student would have to read widely in the novel, poetry, and drama, as well as in considerable political theory as revealed by the present conservative-liberal debate.

The second part will thus observe what individual men do in the presence of problems; students will study human choice in Antigone, Oedipus, Prometheus,

Socrates, Hamlet, Galileo, Joan, Faust, Tess, Nora, Dimmesdale, Thoreau, Madame Bovary, Washington, Gandhi, Schweitzer. This arrangement, especially as it works as a foil to the first semester of scientific objectivity, is superior to a mere miscellany of Great Books as a course or a chronological selection of great writers which is but a remnant of the old survey of British literature, a course that English departments have expediently used as their "service" to general education without giving much attention to what Great Books are supposed to do. The kind of works of a general nature to go with this treatment of the humanities within an inquiry into contemporary issues would be Unamuno's *Tragic Sense of Life*, Ortega's *The Mission of the University*, and MacLeish's "The Irresponsibles."

MAJORING

Majoring in English fulfills a singular office. It shows the ambiguity in all logic in relation to self: that man is both in a culture and above it, is personally involved yet disinterested, must look out for himself yet be morally concerned, be free yet disciplined, loving yet logical, rooted yet world-minded. General education can hardly cope with this existential dialectic.

Majoring is thus first concerned with the self-integration of each particular teacher-to-be. It must be vigilant that expertness is not gained at the cost of self-development, that competence can rarely be in balance without some reasonable unity of knowledge.

Majoring in English without the aim of self-development tends to drop into vocational education in the sense that it becomes something that a teacher makes a living by, makes money by. Plato divorces general education from the artisans and laborers, and also vocational education from the experience of his philosopher-kings, the rulers. Thus the philosopher ruler, by the exercise of reason alone, would never know when something went wrong in the republic until the workers, who would be the only ones who would know where the shoe pinches, complained or revolted. Likewise the gentleman in the age of reason and the courtier of the Renaissance had their livelihood made certain by sources of income other than their subject matter or by being able to hire the competence of others. In a democracy like ours vocational education is a necessary ingredient in any man's education but not a sufficient one. English becomes in most English departments plainly vocational, a phase of the division of labor in our society as well as in the college. It is a familiar sight to see English-as-a-trade sticking out all over a professor rather than English-as-a-humanity.

In a democracy based on technology, myriad specialties are needed, many of which require a long period of time, rigorous concentration, and exclusive focus for their mastery. This process, often called research, has today appropriated the ends of collegiate education, often plunging the specialist into escapism or, as the poet MacLeish puts it, irresponsibility, or, according to Ortega y Gasset, neobarbarism. Majoring, however, is not specialization. The chaotic content of English in high school is due as much to the scrambled content of college English departments as it is to something labeled progressive—"life adjustment." Majoring instead should reveal how English enters into life, and if this means the

life of the pupil in high school, even the life of the culturally deprived, then we are also in educational method, or pedagogy, are we not? Both Priestley and MacLeish in successive addresses before the National Council have made this the burden of English itself. Whatever we call this inquiry, it belongs somewhere.

The English teacher today, just as the doctor and the lawyer and the engineer, is lacking in range and comprehensiveness to make the decisions that his day by day teaching tasks require. His very specialized competence often turns myopic. Those teaching the humanities assume that because they are replete with these "liberal" subjects on their transcripts, they themselves possess the culture that they deplore as lacking in the doctor, the scientist, the executive. All they have done very often is to professionalize the humanities. Hence it is that majoring may be a more insidious form of vocationalization than the so-called methods courses. And to confuse the threefold division still more, the courses presently labeled "educationally professional," called the sociology of education and child growth and development, because they are at the very core of the preservation and transmission of the humanities, are indeed the very base of liberal education. I predict that in a few decades courses in the nature and conduct of education, now generally looked down upon, will be the heart of general education required by all.

To sum up, majoring is a systematic means toward expertness. Majoring in English in the main is an effort to win control of man's most human possession—language—not for its own sake, but for richer living. In the procuring of this control, the major should have these experiences.

1. He should understand the historical changes in his own language, so that he might appreciate its present condition.
2. He should have a philosophical probing into the relation among grammar, logic, and reality; the genetic development of thought and the modes of its presentation; methods of inquiry and communication in the non-verbal languages.
3. He should have an opportunity to try out the creative literary act, whether he is going to be a writer or not.
4. He should be able to interpret various literary forms orally.
5. He should understand what is entailed when language becomes art, is used to contain and interpret an aspect of "life." At least one literary form should be traced and explored in depth.
6. The full development of one major author should be studied: the growth of his art, his being and his art, his art and its age; his art to subsequent ages.
7. He should know the various approaches that have been used to appraise a work of art.
8. Any study of a movement in literary art, or of an age, or of literature over a period of time, should be seen as an abstraction from a total culture and its thematic organization as hypothetical.

The study of "English" is now ambiguous. In one sense Euripides, Dante, and Goethe are as much "English" as is Milton. Coverage surveys in American and British literature are unnecessary in majoring and gaps can be frankly acknowledged; these can easily be filled in time. Competence in English is essentially the knowledge of the possibilities and limitations, philosophically, of language; a grounding in the meaning of art, particularly literary art as form; the way literary art has originated and has been used under various cultural

conditions. If a department omits or fails in these competencies, it is not performing its unique function. I cannot imagine a teacher of English in high school doing well without them, even in teaching the slow learner or the culturally deprived.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Now the methods course under present conditions of college English departmental teaching often becomes a last minute shoring-up of weaknesses, filling in gaps, patching up the casualties from overlecturing and so on. And those of you who have examined the various texts on the teaching of English will immediately note that nearly half the volume of each is devoted to English, not the teaching of it. Our present task of creating a methods course is by definition much different. Given the rich general background as I described it ideally and assuming a genuine competence in English, is there anything left for the methods course to do? Just as English itself is an abstraction from total knowledge, that is, a focus on the "forming" and the presenting of ideas and an evaluation of this performance, so the methods course is an abstraction, a focus on the means and ends of the art of teaching to others this competence in "forming" and presenting ideas, and an evaluation of how well this teaching is done.

At once, however, we are reminded that for higher learning there is at present no methods course at all, and so why should there be one for high school, especially since high school under the banner of the new excellence is growing more and more like college? Though there is no course in method, obviously higher education does have a method. The issue is *whether it is so unimportant or so illusive as not needed to be examined at all.* The justification of the methods course for high school teaching on the grounds that the pupils are younger and most of them are not going to college, and many of these come from culturally deprived circumstances, is to me not a very valid one. As if method exists primarily to reach one kind of humanity and not other kinds!

Under ideal conditions of general education and of majoring, what should be the content of the "ideal" methods course?

1. It should briefly trace from 1890 on what English in America was thought to be at various times, and in what different ways English has been taught. It should reveal what ideas, what movements of thought, what circumstances, caused the teaching of English to be changed.
2. It should show how two great concerns of free public education in a democracy have altered the teaching of English: (a) the numerous curricular devices of handling the vast range of individual differences; (b) the different attempts to organize our exploding knowledge for the purposes of instruction.
3. It should reveal the evolution of the unit method and rigorously and critically pursue the logic and psychologies behind it. Units of English instruction should be made to be actually taught by the student teacher.
4. Variations and improvements of the assign-study-recite tradition as an alternative to the unit method should be explored. This would include (a) a critical analysis of the text as a resource in teaching, a thorough examination of its limitations and strengths, and how to teach beyond a text or without one; (b) the place of the lecture or "telling" in secondary teaching; (c) making creative assignments; (d) modes of supervised study; (e) the climate and dynamics of a group in the development of thought; (f) evaluation and testing in English.

5. How to wring out the levels of meaning in a literary work for curriculum purposes. Conceptualizing the material; thematic organization in surveys; courses of study in the making; articulating courses from year to year.
6. There should be a thorough investigation of the thought processes needed in English. Ways of developing concepts; problem solving; nature of creativity; awareness of logic and movement of mental processes in such gross terms as unity, coherence, causation, generalization, interpretation, critical thinking.
7. How a school makes a philosophy, and what is entailed in fitting the subject of English into the philosophy should be demonstrated by reading courses of study from all over the country and an appraisal of them according to best theory.
8. What ways are available to organize the elements of English: how grammar may serve the skills of writing; how composition may grow out of literature; how reading may be improved through a knowledge of the structure of language; how the pupil's logic may be sharpened through close reading; how to relate speech to grammar and speech to writing.
9. There should be reading of research in English in the methods classroom to illustrate and explain practice. There should be practice in reading at the scholarly level and then extrapolating it for classroom teaching.

INTERNSHIP: STUDENT TEACHING

Conant suddenly catapulted student teaching into the forefront of teacher preparation. Although I think he has gone too far into sheer practice without adequate theory and is naive in relying almost solely on the so-called veteran or master teacher in the field, he does call attention to what many of us have been thinking without saying for years: the heart of teacher preparation is in the practice teaching. And yet here, to me, is the greatest single weakness in the program. The cooperating teacher undoubtedly holds the key, but given the National Council report, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, one shudders at the dearth of good English teachers, and one is overcome by the lack of continuing education of those who have taught for years. Over the years we have not drawn up a set of criteria in the selection of those who are to work with and guide student teachers.

One recoils at the slowly building image of a master teacher as one who can stand before several hundred pupils and lecture; or as one "who gets results," is a "drill master," or "bears down on the kids." Again and again, recent research into instructional practice, rather than in learning theory, uncovers the doctrinaire, inflexible, conservative mode of classroom recitation, untouched even by the report of the earliest committees like that of 1890. It may be that a certificate of proficiency should be attained by those who are to guide the future teacher. But what should such a teacher be like? I should like to meet a cooperating teacher sometime who has the theoretical justification for teaching what he does. How would he defend teaching *The Faerie Queen* for fifteen minutes, spending five minutes on neoclassic elements in Jane Austen, consuming every Friday on twenty-five vocabulary words out of no context, taking four weeks of the student teacher's time getting pupils ready for the big national objective test, going over four weeks of grammar without the pupils ever once writing a sentence of their own, assigning *Of Mice and Men* to eighth graders, and a project on *Pamela* to a tenth grader, matching authors and titles of no importance, framing true-false tests of trivia from *Moby Dick*, going through a survey work by

work with no concept tying anything together—these, and worse than these, are what my student teachers are required to submit to constantly. Few teachers have a wide command of the subject—semantics, logic, the "life" in English—know, for instance, the logic behind the unit method, the meaning of logical inquiry, the conceptualization of the material, a philosophy of art. Most English teachers are technicians, seldom creative, exploratory, experimental in outlook, and our young beginning teachers in time are swallowed up by this attitude. The Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education reports in this vein: "An even greater deficiency exists in teachers' failure to grasp their subject at the level of basic premise." The Council makes a distinction between knowing one's subject and "mastery of one's subject for teaching purposes. . . ."

There is a myth that the methods course is all inflated theory and student teaching is all down-to-earth practice and that this practice by its own inherent nature as practice tests out the armchair notions of the methods course. The actual state of affairs is that this theory is generally the distillation of sound procedures forged in thousands of classrooms, and if these do not yield the results expected, the outcome is most often due to curriculum conditions in the school, the imposed limitations of the cooperating teacher, and the greenness of the student teacher, or the shoddy presentation of theory by the methods professor. The principal defect of the methods course is that at present it has too many practical devices and not enough theory. The methods course, when in the hands of teachers with little or no experience in high school teaching or with little grounding in philosophy, suffers because the beginning teacher does not comprehend how the theory was arrived at. The student teacher must learn that practice modifies theory but does not create it.

The important thing is that there be a unifying purpose running through general education, majoring, and professional education—one plainly pointed out to the future English teacher. This unity should consist, first, of searching for self-integration out of the ever accumulating, pluralistic heritage as means; second, the immediate culture as impact on one's own existence as a teacher by the study of literature as art, and language as one's expression of this impact. Third, as the search proceeds, the teacher-to-be should be made aware of how and why he is being educated as he is, for then he becomes aware of what teaching is. The whole culminates into a design for both *living* and teaching. This union becomes liberal education, because method in education, he comes to see, is embedded in a theory of education, which in turn has little meaning, he understands, unless tied into and emanating from a philosophy of life (a vision of the universe, society, and man). The daily items, acts, and choices of the classroom thus are rooted in a grand design. We will then no longer need the mystique of being born a teacher, the exhortation to inspiration as method, the reliance on more and more subject matter as competence, the appeal to knowledge as conscience. For the future teacher is now on the road to a liberal education.

ENGLISH, SPEECH, AND THE LANGUAGE ARTS: DISORDER AND LATTER DAY SORROW

Donald K. Smith, University of Minnesota

I want to start with three assumptions which seem necessary to the burden of my argument.

The first of these is that knowledge about the nature and functioning of language is the central subject matter of the common school language arts curriculum. In saying this I don't intend to minimize the importance of instruction in communication skill or in literature. Nor do I suggest separation of the study of language from the study of communication skill or literature. But I do want to point toward the subject of language as the intellectual center of our field—the structure of information and conceptualization which we should be seeking to transmit.

My second assumption is that knowledge about language is related to the skill with which people manage themselves in a symbol-using civilization, and related in ways which transcend the usual definition we give to communication skill. I think that those of us who teach speaking or writing often overestimate our capacity to affect materially certain kinds of behavior with which we often become preoccupied. I am impressed by Joos's observation that homeostasis will keep the supply of "good" and "bad" English in our culture relatively constant,[1] and I'm depressed by the hours I have devoted to an effort to modify some rather serviceable language behaviors. But I am also persuaded that, as Niels Bohr put it, we all live "suspended in language."[2] And I think that the more we know about that sea in which we are suspended, the more likely we are to keep sensibly afloat in it. In short, I assume that knowledge about language is efficient in the development of communication skill, but not necessarily, immediately, or automatically effective in relation to those skills we most often look for in classroom essays or speeches. In this sense, instruction about language is an aspect of the language arts curriculum separable from, though not irrelevant to, the aspect which gives direct instruction in writing, speaking, reading, or listening.

My final assumption is that you will grant a speech teacher the right to speak of the common school language arts curriculum as "our" curriculum, and even to appropriate this position of joint proprietorship when the curriculum travels under the name English. This is a courtesy I need in order not to speak as an angry outsider. In return for the courtesy I will promise not to develop an argument that every high school teacher of English should have at least a minor in the field of speech.

Renouncing the opportunity for this argument on this occasion gives me some pain. But I really came to talk on a matter of less parochial interest—the ques-

---

[1] Martin Joos "The Five Clocks," *International Journal of American Linguistics*, XXVIII (April, 1962), 62.

[2] Aage Peterson, "The Philosophy of Niels Bohr," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, September, 1963, p. 9.

tion of the status of instruction about language in the secondary school language arts curriculum.

I.

In 1960 the College Entrance Examination Board issued a short description of the proper divisions of the secondary school English curriculum. The statement sets forth three general "names"—language, literature, and composition—for labeling the content of the high school curriculum. So far as I can determine, this three-legged paradigm produced little intellectual stir. It was greeted, I suppose, with no more sense of surprise than might proceed from an announcement by the American Academy that the three coordinate branches of the federal government were to be called the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches. After all, the names language, literature, and composition have been used by English teachers for some time. The CEEB training institutes had forecast this structure. And even if the statement did avoid mention of speaking as a possible communication skill, it was a brief statement unlikely to include everything. Only trouble makers or speech teachers would be sensitive about such an omission, and I should leave it to you to decide whether I have cited one or two categories.

Now I am certainly a speech teacher and occasionally a trouble maker, but I don't believe it was either of these two roles that aroused my anxieties when I first read the CEEB statement. Two matters did arouse me. One was the remarkable similarity between the formulation offered by the CEEB in the 1960's and the formulation central to the establishment of English as a high school subject which emerged in the great reorganization of the secondary schools between 1890 and 1920. In the early part of this century we were saying that the high school English field had three divisions: grammar, composition, and literature. Substitute the word grammar for the word language—and the substitution would not be inappropriate from the definition the CEEB gives to the study of language—and it would appear that we could be in the process of disproving the contention that history does not repeat itself. I find this prospect disquieting.

The second matter that aroused me was one to which I have already alluded, the definition given by the CEEB to the study of language. The study of language, said the Board, should . . . "include: (a) spelling, (b) the enrichment of vocabulary, (c) systematic study of word derivations and change in word meanings, (d) mastery of the forms of English usage characteristic in the spoken and written discourse of educated people, and (e) some competence in modern linguistic analysis through the study of modern English grammar." Now this seems to me a remarkable narrowing of the concept of the study of language. Three of the five points have to do with writing or speaking behaviors; they only imply study *about* language. The other two points suggest a study of grammar plus some historical linguistics. The definition makes no reference to the question of language development, or the problem of reference and meaning, or the problem of effect beyond the context of usage, and so forth. It is a narrowing not unlike that which occurred in the early part of the twentieth century. Its correlates then included part of the explanation for the departmental separation of the speech and English fields in American higher education, and a good measure

of the explanation for the lack of conceptual structure which has afflicted language arts instruction ever since. Or at least, this is the way I read the history of the English field, the speech field, and the secondary school language arts curriculum. If this is the history we are preparing to repeat, then I'm against the effort.

II.

To this point I have been producing assertions more rapidly than proof. However, before I proceed with my analysis I do want to make it clear that I have no real animus toward the statement of the College Entrance Examination Board. My concern is that the definition given to the study of language by the Board was one that might have emerged from a hundred sources, that it is altogether an unexceptional definition. My thesis this evening is not that the CEEB is peculiarly wrong headed but that we have been laboring for many years in secondary school language arts instruction in a state of some confusion as to what is meant, or might be meant, or should be meant by the study of language. This confusion has had the most serious consequences for the high school language arts curriculum, and some resolution of the confusion seems to me a precondition of sensible curriculum reform, or sensible resolution of the problems of teacher education for the high schools. I want to proceed by giving an accounting of the nature of the disorder as I see it, the nature of its consequences, and then to conclude with a brief observation about the intellectual problem which I believe now confronts the field of English education.

III.

To understand what has happened to the study of language in the secondary schools, I think it useful to return to the circumstances under which high school English was born. The general outlines of this story, are I am certain, familiar to all of you, and I shall give them the briefest possible attention. High school English appeared as a major track or sequence in the high schools as part of the major reorganization of secondary school education occurring generally in the decades from 1870 to 1920, with particular emphasis on the decades after 1890. Prior to this time, English language instruction had taken place under a bewildering set of titles. A single school might offer courses in grammar, rhetoric, logic, word analysis, elements of criticism, discourse analysis, English literature, composition, and elocution. If one asks how so many courses could be devoted to the study of English and still permit students to engage in other studies, the answer of course is to be found in methods of curriculum planning and class scheduling somewhat unfamiliar to our own age. The courses were not taught each day of the week, nor week of the year, nor at every grade level. Nevertheless the very profusion of course titles in a period of expanding secondary school enrollments set the stage for reform, for curricular consolidation.

The reform discovered for English language instruction in the high schools paralleled the development of departments of English in American colleges and universities. Briefly stated the reform said that the name English would carry the legacy of English language instruction in the high schools, and that the name would include the study of grammar, of composition, both oral and written, and

of literature. One cannot turn to the discussion of such groups as the North Central Association, the Committee of Ten, or the Eastern Association of Schools and Colleges in the years around the turn of the twentieth century without sensing the magnitude of the revision undertaken through the consolidation of the high school English curriculum. Equally one senses the speed with which the new set of titles took root, and the optimism generated by sweeping reform. The titles under which instruction in language and language skills had taken place in previous generations went unmourned. Elocution was not dead, but it was dying;[3] logic, an early loser in the secondary school curriculum, had become the possession of collegiate departments of philosophy; the title of composition was thought to keep all that was useful in the older name of rhetoric and to give a practical focus to that ancient discipline; and if the students needed knowledge, the study of literature and grammar would give them more than they asked for.

A sense of good work, well begun, pervades the discussions of both secondary school and college teachers in the decades from 1890 to 1920. Many of them had lived through the golden age of vintage McGuffey and were not charmed with its products. At Harvard, Professor Hurlbut could recall the ineffectiveness of his own high school instruction in English in the late 70's—of four years spent in high school without writing a single theme. A. S. Hill could also refer to a dismal past in which "graduates of our best colleges could not write a letter home describing their own commencement without making blunders which would disgrace a boy twelve years old."[4] The colleges would do their part to teach grammar and composition, and through proper entrance examinations they would encourage the high schools to do their part. Everyone would look forward to the day when excellent high school education would relieve the colleges of worry about such mundane matters as usage, spelling, punctuation, grammar, and clear expository writing. Those who wrote well would also speak well, as that notoriously erratic informer "common sense" should tell us.

It is tempting to pause here to comment on the perennially broken hopes of those of us who get involved in any direct way with instruction in speaking or writing. If all else changes in our time, there is one secure island of changelessness—that island—the stubborn refusal of the vast majority of mankind to write or speak in a manner pleasing to those charged with their instruction.

IV.

But my concern this evening is not with change or changelessness, with hopes or disappointments, but rather with the question of what was happening to the study of language.

---

[3] This brief reference does little justice to the history of the elocution movement which attracted, over a period of almost two centuries, the services of a number of able teachers and scholars. The movement left its mark on the development of linguistic science, and on the theory of reading and acting. See Frederick W. Haberman, "English Sources of American Elocution," and Mary M. Robb, "The Elocutionary Movement and Its Chief Figures," in Karl R. Wallace (ed.), *A History of Speech Education in America* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), pp. 105–128, 178–201.

[4] Hurlbut's and Hill's comments are found in a series of papers published by Harvard University in 1896 in a pamphlet entitled: "Twenty Years of School and College English."

What was happening is I believe properly described as follows: the study of language proposed in the consolidation of the high school English curriculum in the early part of this century was not a consolidation of the kind of knowledge about language which had emerged from the whole tradition of Western education; it was rather a sharp and somewhat accidental narrowing of the definition to be given to the study of language. This narrowing occurred primarily, I believe, because the newly created college departments of English, which furnished the intellectual base for the high school English curriculum, were themselves part of the picture of increasing collegiate specialization which has dominated the history of higher education for the last century. I find it interesting and important to note that collegiate departments of English emerged as part of a general movement toward specialization in higher education, whereas high school English emerged as part of a movement toward consolidation or integration in the secondary school. The identity of titles for two movements of such disparate tendency was fateful. These interpretations obviously need some explanation, and the explanation can be most quickly provided by a screening of the nature of the mission assumed by emerging departments of English against the background of the study of language which had been traditional in western European education.

In the early nineteenth century, following the precedent set by the entire history of western European education, the study of language proceeded within a framework provided by a small set of general names. These names were grammar, dialectic or logic, and rhetoric. The educational practices and bodies of theory comprehended by these names were by no means static through medieval, renaissance, and early modern education, but I must avoid such complexities in the interests of my present purpose. The names of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric had persisted for many centuries; taken together with their subdivisions they defined the scope of study about the nature of language; and they were held in somewhat common understanding by the educated people of any given generation. In an altogether preliminary and potential sense, the kind of knowledge represented by these names comprehended the two major ways of looking at language characteristic of our own age. That is, rhetoric and dialectic, in the Greek and Roman tradition, looked at language as a form of distinctively human communicative behavior. These subjects produced statements about the nature and purpose of discourse, the conditions under which discourse became effective in the conduct of interpersonal relations, or the conditions under which discourse was efficient in carrying out certain purposes. Grammar looked toward the system underlying the behavior and achieved an early if somewhat naive triumph in the direction of descriptive rigor.

You will sense a certain intention in the way in which I have defined the intellectual thrust of classical rhetoric, dialectic, and grammar. I have set my definitions within the framework provided by our contemporary sense of the ways in which language can be studied. To clarify this point let me abstract a view of language provided by a contemporary linguist, John Carroll. Carroll sees language as a structured system of arbitrary vocal sounds and sequences of sounds which is used in interpersonal communication and which rather exhaus-

tively catalogs the things, events, and processes of human experience.[5] Explicit in Carroll's viewpoint is the picture of language as an abstract code—a structured system—, as a form of human communicative behavior involving problems of reference and effect, and as an index of culture. Laying aside for the moment the anthropologist's view of the relationship of language and culture, I think it apparent that the classical tradition of language study anticipated the major lines of study about language characteristic of our own century. I do not mean to give more credit for insight to ancient grammarians and rhetoricians than they deserve, nor to suggest that the knowledge they accumulated and taught was not often as erratic as Aristotelian physics—although ancient rhetoric and dialectic stand up somewhat better than ancient grammar. But I do mean to say that the tradition studied language in a reasonably comprehensive way in terms of the knowledge about language available. And I want particularly to suggest that although the tradition associated the study of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric with the acquisition of skill in speaking and writing, it considered all of these subjects as substantive, as bodies of knowledge, and not merely as handmaidens to speaking or writing exercises.

V.

The last half of the nineteenth century, the period in which the subject known as English came into being, found the traditional framework for the study of language in a state of acute disorder, disrepair, and decline. The reasons for this were complex, but I do think it important to observe that English departments were not created primarily from the materials provided by the traditional study of language, nor were they born as an enterprise primarily devoted to the revitalization of this tradition. Logic, as I have already suggested, was on its way toward becoming a special child of departments of philosophy. Rhetoric was in the process of disintegration. One part of its traditional energy was to be carried into departments of English to support the expanding study of belles lettres. Another part, in vitiated form, was to be absorbed by the wasteland of elementary instruction in composition where, until recent years, the name itself was found increasingly dispensable.

A third part was carried into departments of speech through instruction in public address and disputation, and through a holding action on the study of rhetorical literature from the point of view of the canons of rhetoric rather than those of poetic.[6] A fourth part, interestingly enough, was dispersed into the emerging social sciences. Studies of the conditions of effect in discourse were to become a growing passion in sociology and psychology, and rhetorical perspectives were commonplace in the works of historians and anthropologists.

---

[5] John B. Carroll, *The Study of Language: A Survey of Linguistics and Related Disciplines in America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 289.

[6] An exposition of the differences in literary and rhetorical criticism was published by Herbert Wichelns in 1925: Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York: The Century Company, 1925), pp. 181–216; reissued (New York: Russell & Russell, Inc., 1962).

In short, of the trivium, only grammar [7] was to be treated by English departments as a coherent and essential body of knowledge about language. The energizing principle behind the growth of departments of English was the study of the vernacular literature. The growth of this study was and is remarkable, and should be viewed I believe as a triumph of man's unquenchably humanistic spirit seeking release from the bloodless hand of classical learning. But it was not a growth that promised much for the cultivation of the study of language. The field of English grew on a base which had attenuated interest in the study of language even as it expanded the scope of the study of literature.

From such a context it is not surprising that the formation of the high school English curriculum tended to equate the study of language with the study of grammar, to ignore logic except as represented in the pious wish of every teacher of composition that his students think clearly, and to forget rhetoric except for the admonitions one gives students before and after they have revealed their insufficiencies in writing. The story of an attenuated base for language study is not complete without some reference to the peculiar status of traditional grammar as a body of knowledge. In retrospect, seldom has a weaker intellectual tradition assumed such awesome responsibility. The grammar taught in 1900 and still widely taught was not about the system of language but about writing. Although it sometimes purported to be rigorously descriptive and deductively pure, it was in fact a prescriptive study mingling with graceless abandon statements about what was the case with statements about what should be the case. It spawned rules with guppy-like abandon much in the manner of medieval rhetoricians cataloging figures of speech. And since the rules weren't rules, it was forced into a constant rescue operation. It sought to require English to behave as Latin was thought to have behaved, and it served as the not altogether unconscious agent of a social class. An intellectually rigorous and inquiring grammar might at least have given secondary school instruction one kind of systematic knowledge about language capable of growth. But the secondary school teachers of English by the early 1920's were in increasing numbers simply abandoning this substantive child, partly by increased attention to the canon of usage, and partly by increased devotion to the study of literature.

VI.

The consequences, or correlates, of the circumstances surrounding the study of language in the early part of this century have been reasonably implicit in much that I have said thus far. For one thing, those circumstances made all but inevitable the separation of speech departments from departments of English. The subjects of dialectic and rhetoric had always been indifferent to the line between speaking and writing, and I think it significant that both these subjects have been much honored, if not greatly reinforced by speech departments. That is, major speech departments were in part developed by teachers with a major

[7] A more complete account would give attention to the role of philology and historical linguistics in emerging departments of English. I am simplifying my statement here to focus on the general fate of the coherent structure of knowledge provided for classical education by the trivium.

74

interest in rhetoric and dialectic rather than in poetic.[8] The grammar of 1900 was of little interest to persons interested in speech as a form of human behavior. It is tempting to wonder what might have been the fate of relationships between English and speech had either field pursued vigorously the line of linguistic study advocated by Bloomfield as early as 1914 and anticipated by the pioneer works of linguistic science of the nineteenth century.[9]

But the separation occurred; speech teachers sought without total success to shake the ghost of elocution from their instruction; to make the study of vocal behavior somewhat more scientific; to submit some rhetorical generalizations to empirical study; and to keep within memory the materials of the rhetorical and dialectical tradition. Professor Harold Allen and I have sometimes discussed whether or not the separation needed to occur, and whether or not its occurrence has been on balance more productive than harmful. We haven't resolved either point, but we do agree that the separation has produced some unmerciful complications in planning a sensible structure for a secondary school language arts curriculum, and a sensible education for those who are to teach in this curriculum.

I have been reminded annually of these complications by my efforts for some twenty years to teach a course in the teaching of speech. Some of the first and most baffling questions raised by prospective high school teachers are these: Where is speech taught in the secondary schools? Is it a part of the English class, or is it a separate course or sequence? What is the content of the speech curriculum, and how does this relate to the content of the English curriculum? The questions are baffling because in some schools it is assumed that the required English or language arts sequence includes systematic instruction in speech; this has been the historic position of the NCTE, and it is given more than lip service at times. In other schools the assumption is made that the study of English does not include the study of speech. In some schools speech units are taught as part of the English sequence; in others a semester or year course in speech appears as part of this sequence; in others elective courses in speech are taught alongside the English sequence. I have only begun to describe the various options now in practice, including the option selected by some schools of ignoring speech al-

[8] For a detailed account of the forces giving rise to departments of speech, see Donald K. Smith, "Origin and Development of Departments of Speech," in Karl R. Wallace (ed.), *History of Speech Education in America* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), pp. 447–470.

[9] Professor Lee Hultzén of the University of Illinois has recently observed that when " . . . speech personnel broke off from departments of English they took language with them and left only the shadow behind. They never seemed to realize, however, that they had hold of the real thing." (Lee S. Hultzén, "Linguistics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, February, 1964, p. 79.)

The problem in the early twentieth century, of course, was that speech teachers were just as much ready as English teachers to accept the identity of writing and language. Woolbert's definition of speech as a behavior embodying the codes of voice, action, and language set a structure for conceptualizing speech which has dominated that field for more than forty years. Woolbert, a psychologist studying speech, and Bloomfield, a linguist studying the same behavior, needed to discover one another. But both lived long before psychologists and linguists found any common language. Woolbert's way of conceptualizing speech and Bloomfield's way could have been reconciled, and together they might have spared us from such ear-cracking titles as paralinguistics and kinesiology, which now seem inescapable.

together. But I think you can judge the difficulty of telling a prospective speech teacher about the probable nature of the job he faces.

Equally confusing is the task of rationalizing our present patterns of teacher preparation for the high school. If speech instruction is indeed an integral part of the high school English curriculum, how do we explain a teacher preparation curriculum which ignores the question of college preparation in speech?

A second consequence of the narrow basis established for English language instruction has been that the secondary school English field has survived for the last half century without discovering any commonly accepted body of knowledge about language thought clearly to be teachable and worth teaching to high school students. The problem of sequence and structure for the content of instruction about the English language remains for the most part an unsolved problem. It is extraordinarily difficult to discover principles of order and sequence for a body of knowledge if you don't know what goes into the body. And this, I think, is not an inappropriate description of our situation. One must be cautious of praise about the amount of knowledge shared by our population about the physical universe, about history, about politics and government, about personal health, or about literature and music. But I think it is fair to say that substantive illiteracy about the nature and functioning of language runs deeper in our culture than any other intellectual shortcoming.

The third consequence is that lacking an elementary frame of reference for defining the nature and scope of the study of language, the high school English field has been ill equipped to assimilate new knowledge about language as it appeared. New knowledge about language has been piling up in our century not only faster than we have been able to consider its uses to our instruction, but often in places that we haven't even been examining. The knowledge has been the product of linguistic scientists, linguistically oriented anthropologists, philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, a new cross-bred genus called psycholinguists, and most recently even the mathematicians have been joining the hunt. The study of language has now become the traditional passion of philosophers, and its seems to be the emerging passion of nearly all parts of the sprawling establishment of the behavioral sciences. If I sense properly what is happening in the English field today, substantial progress is being made to absorb the materials and methods of linguistic science into the common school curriculum. The process of absorption will be slow, burdensome, and productive of many frustrations: old grammars never die, they just fade away. But the cause is well worth the effort since the name of the cause happens to be the pursuit of reliable knowledge.

But my real concern as you may gather is not that we shall fail to improve our instruction in the analysis of language as a code or system, and thereby improve the condition of human understanding of language. We are not failing on this task. My real concern is that we shall stop short of any sustained effort to come to grips with the knowledge now available about language as a form of human behavior. It seems to me our students need to know something about how language is learned, about its functions, about the way it mirrors and shapes culture, about the conditions under which it produces certain effects, about the

relationship of its larger forms to the forms of our various social institutions. I am prepared to accept the proposition that there is more known about language than any one of us is likely to know, and much more than we should ever try to teach in the common schools. But I am unprepared to accept the proposition that we can decide sensibly about what we should teach, and about the order and structure within which we should teach it, until we have looked at the shape and substance of the whole field of the study of language.

In short, I think the field of English education faces a formidable intellectual task. The task is so basic that it should take precedence over any of the immediate problems of instructional logistics that we all know so well, with the possible exception of the work of developing English language instruction for the large population we now refer to as culturally deprived. The task is this: the discovery of the content and sequence of knowledge about language which should be part of the secondary school language arts curriculum.

This work must be done, I believe, before we can get any very sensible answers about the form of the college major most suitable for the preparation of the high school language arts teacher. It must be done before we can get reasonable answers about the relationship of instruction in English to instruction in speech in the high school. It must be done before we can give any stable definition to the nature of the informational and conceptual content of the high school curriculum.

This work will be difficult. Knowledge about language is not now being systematically assembled, organized, and taught in any one of our existing college departments. The synthesis and systematization needed for the common school curriculum is not a work that those interested in English education can readily expect to be performed except as they themselves bring pressure and organization to the work. Since the work will be difficult, there is every reason we should be getting to it.

A Report on Volume V

THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University

I don't know just when the idea for Volume V was conceived. But as background for this discussion, I wish first to sketch briefly its history and to review its purpose and scope. As early as 1949, the original Commission on the English Curriculum appointed a committee to explore the possibility of preparing a single book encompassing recommendations for the preparation of beginning teachers of English for elementary and secondary schools and colleges and universities. By 1952, the Commission had decided to conclude its Curriculum Series with Volume V on teacher education. The book was intended, as stated in the preface of Volume I, *The English Language Arts*, to "consider the training of teachers necessary to the success of this curriculum," that is, of the curriculum presented in the preceding four volumes in the series. By 1953 a temporary committee was appointed, first, to consider further the feasibility of putting into one volume programs necessary for the preparation of teachers of English ranging from primary grades to graduate schools; and, second, to prepare a tentative outline showing in some detail what a book of this scope might include. The next year this report was accepted by the Commission, a production committee was appointed, and a list of names of potential contributors was prepared. The Commission and production committee tried to get representatives of different parts of the country, different kinds of institutions and points of view, and of the three major segments of our education system. By 1956 a much more detailed outline of each chapter was accepted, and several writers had agreed to prepare materials. The bulk of the writing and rewriting, however, was done during 1961–62. James R. Squire, Mrs. Enid M. Olson, and Robert F. Hogan prepared the final manuscript for the publisher.

Because of the breadth of the book, costs of production, and the ever shortening time, much material, including an entire chapter, had to be cut from the final draft. Throughout the rewriting and editing, the production committee and the NCTE staff tried to achieve some sort of unity in the kinds and organization of materials in each of the four parts of the book, to honor the individual style of each contributor yet fashion a somewhat unified point of view and mode of presentation. We tried also to eliminate undesirable duplication of materials without omitting from any one of the four parts information essential to readers who may elect to read only those parts directly related to their interests. To counter this inclination, however, we closed the introduction with this reminder, a paraphrase of Donne, "no segment of our educational system is 'an Ilande intire of its selfe'."

This project, circumscribed by the foregoing conditions, took at least fourteen years to complete. Mr. Conant, however, generously supported by the Carnegie Corporation, working full-time on his study, helped by a team of assistants, some

78

of whom also worked with him full-time, and being Mr. Conant, assembled his "camel," alas, in only two years.[1]

I don't intend to take time here to review unnecessarily what you may have already read. But I thought that as additional background for this discussion I would mention some of the problems we confronted in our treatment of the preparation of teachers of English and some of the emphases in our recommendations. I should also like to explain why we didn't develop some topics and excluded others. As is obvious throughout the book, we do not try to shake down the establishment. Instead, we advocate what we consider to be the most constructive principles in teacher education and generalize upon what seems to us to be promising practices.

The primary problem we emphasize affects all segments of our schools and colleges: the need for vigorous, continuous recruitment of talented students for careers in teaching. The continuing widespread shortage of *qualified* teachers of English was reported in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, published by the Council in 1961, and, I understand, will be underscored in the follow-up study, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*, to be published this spring.

In reviewing the studies of the academic caliber of students preparing to teach, we point out that the evidence is not so clear-cut an indictment of the intelligence of us as teachers as some of our critics insist on maintaining. Nevertheless, older studies do reveal that, at that time at least, many students preparing to teach had not made good grades, especially in academic departments, nor did they score well on tests intended to measure academic aptitude. We need a comprehensive, up-to-date study to determine the academic caliber of future teachers in a representative sampling of colleges and universities, especially of those preparing to teach in secondary schools and colleges. In previous studies, many of these students were identified with those in academic departments, not with those preparing to teach.

These two needs, numbers and quality, are not contradictory. According to Stout's study[2] of the standards of admission in 785 institutions preparing teachers, those maintaining high standards attracted not only better students but also more of them. Some institutions reported that after they had raised their standards of admission, the number as well as the caliber of candidates in their programs of teacher education increased. Quality programs apparently attract quality students.

One aim of contributors to Volume V was to suggest improvements in the quality of the three segments of programs for educating teachers: general education, teaching fields, and professional education. If we are to attract and hold a greater number of talented students, then we must evaluate not only the quality of our standards but also of programs we offer them.

We point out, too, that prospective teachers apparently tend to return to

[1] James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963).

[2] Ruth A. Stout, "Selection of Teacher Education Students," *The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives* (Washington: National Education Association, 1960).

teach in the kind of school or college in which they had studied. Consequently, school districts and colleges having chronic shortages of teachers should initiate this important cycle by recruiting future teachers from among their best students if they wish to improve their chances of having able students later return to them as teachers.

In discussing the marked increase in the need for teachers of college English, we show the rapid decline in the number of beginning college teachers having the Ph.D. and the consequent increase of beginning full-time teachers who have completed only the M.A. We stress the general neglect of an important source of badly needed additional teachers of college English—women.

Those who have the best opportunity to recruit able students into teaching are instructors of undergraduate English courses, particularly freshman English. Unfortunately, some members of this group, including some departmental chairmen, are not only unaware of these opportunities and attendant responsibilities but, ironically, are even among the most severe critics of the caliber of students preparing to teach. They apparently see no connection between their harsh judgments and their failure to assume any responsibility for talking with bright students about teaching as a career. In discussing the evidence on why we become teachers, we emphasize the great importance of all teachers' realizing that a teacher is the most important single influence upon students who decide to become teachers.

A second problem we considered is that of preparing prospective teachers for schools and colleges of tomorrow, not just those of today or yesterday. I won't take time here to review our description of schools for which future teachers should be prepared. Anyway, newspapers this evening will probably report other developments we'll also have to heed.

A third refrain is the importance of an institution-wide committee to coordinate the planning of programs for educating future teachers. We claim that, whatever the organization within an institution, some means must be found for applying all relevant resources of the institution to the preparation of teachers.

Fourth, we argue for what we consider to be a defensible emphasis throughout the four or five years of a program of teacher education, Conant and Koerner to the contrary. We recommend that approximately 40 percent of a program be devoted to general education, 40 percent to the candidate's teaching subjects, and the remainder to courses in education and teaching. We strongly recommend cooperative planning by departments of English and education and give examples of forms this cooperation may take. We also recommend as a guide the standard of preparation for teachers of English presented in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* and Paul Woodring's list of "Basic Agreements in Teacher Education."[3] We include examples of four-year, five-year, fifth-year, and even six-year programs that meet criteria we recommend. In discussing professional preparation, we present criticisms often made of programs, courses, and instructors, suggest how charges that seem valid may be met, and show that certain aspects of professional courses also contribute to general education and

[3] Paul Woodring, "Basic Agreements in Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, VI (March, 1955), 98–99.

that courses in methods of teaching English and in student teaching and internships also reinforce and extend candidates' preparation in English. We recommend that an institution's committee on teacher education periodically examine the effectiveness of the program, including results of follow-up studies of former students who have become teachers.

Fifth, we have also tried to contribute to the clarification and strengthening of requirements for certification. We draw upon the valuable studies made by John Fisher and Eugene Slaughter of the requirements for the certification of teachers of English in 1954, 1957, and 1960. The trend in strengthening academic requirements throughout those six years is encouraging. We commend states having strong requirements and draw attention to those certifying teachers having weak majors and minors in subject matter. We recommend, too, that whatever public agency is responsible for establishing criteria and procedures for certification appoint representatives of academic departments as well as those from education and professional organizations to help establish the best possible standards for certifying future teachers of English for elementary and secondary schools.

Finally, we point out that whatever the quality of a candidate's education, he obviously begins his teaching as a neophyte. Hence, we stress the importance of each candidate's assuming primary responsibility for his continuing education and of his district's for establishing realistic programs of inservice education for its faculty.

Admittedly, we slighted or ignored several important aspects of preparing teachers of English and of improving English curricula in districts throughout the country. As mentioned earlier, the limitations of space and time forced us to cut much from earlier drafts of the manuscript and to ignore altogether later developments in a teacher's professional career. For example, we give no special attention to candidates preparing to teach in junior high schools. Rather than devote space to the particular features of this preparation, we assume that programs we recommend for general education and academic preparation are appropriate for teachers of English in all grades of secondary schools and that essential adjustments for students preparing to teach in junior high schools are made in courses in methods, teaching of reading, literature for adolescents, observations, and student teaching or internship. We further assume that those teachers also will be dedicated to their continuing education and, hopefully, will be teaching in districts offering enlightened programs of inservice education through which these teachers can develop special talents or overcome problems peculiar to the junior high school.

Nor do we do more than mention the great importance of preparing specialists in the teaching of reading. Again we assume that, as is often the case, a teacher's special interest in reading or speech pathology develops later on the job and that through his continuing education and through his district's support will develop the competency essential to specialists.

We make the same sort of assumptions about the later development of the teacher who becomes interested in preparing himself to help train teachers or

becomes a specialist in supervising teachers of English or in developing curricula for elementary and secondary schools.

I'm sure all of us grant the importance of these problems. Perhaps a supplementary report should be prepared devoted to these and other important matters beyond the scope of Volume V. Perhaps the forthcoming publication, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*, treats the development of these professional skills among experienced teachers. In preparing the concluding volume in the Curriculum Series, however, we limited ourselves to our interpretation of its title: *The Education of (Beginning) Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges.*

I wish to conclude by reviewing seven emphases selected from Volume V: (1) *all* teachers of English must assume responsibility for recruiting *talented* students for the teaching profession; (2) programs of teacher education should be planned under the aegis of a committee representing an institution's commitment of its full resources to the preparation of teachers; (3) recruits should be prepared for schools and colleges of tomorrow; (4) institutions preparing college teachers must recognize that the Ph.D. is a professional degree for teachers of English and that its recipients must be prepared for careers as scholar-*teachers;* (5) the major emphasis in the preparation of all teachers of English must be upon general education and teaching fields; (6) all groups committed to the improvement of education throughout elementary and secondary schools must work to strengthen the requirements and procedures of certification; and, finally, the education of a teacher is a lifetime process, witness our presence here this weekend.

DOES THE NEW ENGLISH DEMAND A NEW ENGLISH EDUCATION?

James R. Squire, National Council of Teachers of English and University of Illinois

About two years ago, immersed in the planning of an NCTE convention, I was suddenly roused from routine matters by a call from a superintendent of a large western state—a man whom I had never met. "Mr. Squire," he said, "I know about the new biology and I know about the new mathematics, but the last few days people around me have been talking about the new English. Please sir," he said, "tell me about the new English, tell me what it is, and what we now need to be doing in our schools." I could not, did not, but have been troubled by the question ever since. Is there a new English, I wondered, or only the same old English, masquerading in different dress. In the two years since that sudden telephone call, I have arrived at some partial answers on my own. I know at least how I would now answer the call, and I wish I had the chance.

Yes, I think there *is* a new English emerging in much the same sense that a new mathematics has perhaps already emerged.

Yes, I believe this new English has important implications for the education of teachers of English.

But I also believe that the profession, almost without knowing it, has already begun work on the new English education.

Each of these ideas needs to be developed in some detail. What is the "new" English? And in what sense does it resemble the "new" biology and the "new" physics? Is not part of the newness found in the restructuring of the subject and the sequences by which it is learned? Look, for example, at the important new book by Hans Guth.[1] I think we must all admit that thus far our reanalysis of English programs has not yet yielded what Bruner calls the "great and simple" unifying concepts around which our total program may be reorganized, and there are those who doubt that English in all of its dimensions will ever yield to such analysis. But it must be clear to all of us that during the past six years we have been undergoing a careful reexamination of ends and means in English, just as we have on at least two other occasions earlier in the century. And like the reexaminations of the Teens and the Thirties, the present ferment has released great energy and fosters great expectation. One of the essential characteristics of the new mathematics and the new biology is the reorganization of content which comes from unifying thinking in a subject area in terms of a rearrangement of content, a reconceptualization of the essential nature of what is learned. Although we are far from achieving any restructuring of the ideas in English, we can see certain forces at work which may lead to an ultimate reorganization of our subject. At least five of these forces may have important implications for teacher education:

a. A greater recognition, first, that English is a content subject as well as a skills subject, and that our teaching in elementary and secondary

[1] Hans Guth, *English for Today and Tomorrow* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964).

schools must recognize this fact. There is content in rhetoric and composition and in language that may be important to teach. No longer do we hear curriculum coordinators, unfortunately some of them specialists in English, asserting such patent nonsense that "There is no content in English" or that "Every teacher is a teacher of English." Moreover, our reawakening to the centrality of content in our subject is related clearly to our new concern with ideas, with concept development, and with the psychology of thinking. It is no accident that before *The Process of Education* came Bruner's *Principles of Thinking*, a more basic and in some ways better book.

b. Next, an awareness that the term "language arts," as defined in popular and professional usage, may not really offer a satisfactory description of our subject, and that the substitution of this modernization of four language arts—reading, writing, speaking, and listening—for the traditional language arts of grammar, rhetoric, and logic, has somehow blurred necessary distinctions between the arts and skills. In the hands of those who clearly understand the fundamental nature of English, however they may define it, this ambiguity and lack of clear definition of priorities has perhaps not really mattered. In the hands of generalists in the curricula, it has mattered very much. "Reading" too often comes to mean the teaching of reading skills, and the program in literature, especially in elementary and junior high school education, has too often been neglected.

c. Third, whether the curriculum stands on a four-component program of the modern language arts, or the three-component program of language, literature, and composition, or on some other division of subject or unity of subject yet to be clearly seen, it seems clear that a broad and basic awareness of language—its history, its structure, *and* its operation—is emerging essential to our program. Most visible perhaps in the noisy arguments over the study of English grammar, the concern is apparent also in discussions of the history of language and its dialectal variation, in the renewed concern about oral language as basic to the study of writing and communication, in our concern for symbolic logic and the processes of communication, in the important, and I think quite basic, attempts to relate our knowledge about the structure of language and the processes of language learning to other elements of the curriculum: in relating, for example, linguistics and reading and spelling; in applying patterns of grammatical analysis of the sentence to larger units of discourse; in the growing attempts to apply linguistics to literature in Morton Bloomfield and Leonard Newmark's linguistic history of literature.[2] Where these attempts will ultimately lead is by no sense clear in our national dialogue, but isn't it becoming increasingly apparent that some new unity of subject is emerging from these efforts?

d. Fourth, we are increasingly concerned about literature as man's attempt to bring order to experience through art, and with leading our students

[2] Morton W. Bloomfield and Leonard Newmark, *A Linguistic Introduction to the History of English* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963).

to this awareness. Thus the reading of any literary work must necessarily utilize a variety of approaches, say—the historical, the biographical, the cultural, the psychological, symbolic, and all of the others as appropriate. What is important is that the reader learn to sense the purpose of the author and the ultimate unity of the work; hence, the increased emphasis on reading, in greater depth, a smaller number of single texts and the decline—at least in emphasis in our theoretical writings—in the broad survey approach. The trend, it seems to me, derives its strength from modern literary criticism, much as yesterday's survey course itself or yesterday's course emphasizing ideas and themes alone reflected yesterday's scholarly trends. In no sense have these pedagogical developments ever been completely isolated from the discipline of English.

e. Finally, we are concerned about the processes of thinking, about concept development, the psychology of language learning as it applies to English teaching—the "discovery" method if you will. These emerging developments, like the others just mentioned, reflect the increasing concern of our psychologists and our scholars with the intellectual basis of education and the processes of thinking by which intellectual goals may be attained. What we have yet to do is to relate some of our new knowledge about the learning of concepts in language and literature, and, more importantly, the ways in which these concepts are learned, to the scholars' awareness of the concepts which may best be learned. The explosion of knowledge in language and literature has *not* fallen far behind that in other fields. Make no mistake about that—it is no longer possible for even the foremost scholar, much less any student or any teacher, to master *all* of English and American literature even if this were once considered desirable. What we must do for student and for teacher in education is to organize a *selected* number of such concepts to learn and to teach those basic to experiences in literature, those which better help us to understand what literature is and what literature does. Thus, in our programs of teacher education, no less than in our schools, we must somehow seek a rapprochement between the processes of learning and the content of learning. Only when this fusion of content and method was closely approached in the foreign languages and, only when it was approached in mathematics and physics as well, did our colleagues in these other disciplines score their "major breakthroughs" that we have yet to achieve. I will submit that it is this failure to relate our new content to a new methodology, more than any other, which prevents us from translating some of our ideas about the "new" English into classroom practice.

These then are five characteristics of the new English which seems to be emerging from our professional thought. What are their implications for the education of teachers of English?

Implications for English Education

I. Let us face the fact, first, that something is drastically wrong in the way we teach educational psychology. Anyone who visits classrooms throughout the

country knows what little effect such college courses seem to have. Indeed so embittered have beginning teachers become about much of their formal work in psychology that their verbal disavowal of value of studying learning and child development—obtained, mind you, in repeated interviews from coast to coast—led James B. Conant to the desperate and unfortunate recommendation that such work be eliminated in the preparation of secondary teachers. This recommendation is a catastrophe for those who view insight into language learning as *central* to the content of our subject.

None of us, I think, can accept the defeat implied in Conant's suggestion, however we may agree with his criticism of present offerings. Indeed one fundamental failure in almost all of our present programs is our failure to recognize clearly that certain basic aspects of the psychology of learning, particularly those dealing with the learning of language, are essential to understanding the very nature of our subject, and, insofar as the education of teachers is concerned, are, therefore, a responsibility which we as English educators must assume. But having said this, I ask where in this country are we really doing the job?

Surely somehow, directly or indirectly, we must see that our beginning teachers know and apply the fruits of new studies by Loban, Strickland, Levin, and Gibson, the important perceptions of Ervin, Miller, Lambert, and Carroll, and extensive other work in this area. Surely we cannot expect our teachers to be responsible for understandings which we ourselves have yet to master. The Director of the Center for Applied Linguistics, Charles Ferguson, stated last fall that "we have learned more about language learning in the last five years that we have learned in the last 100." If so, when will you and I incorporate this new knowledge into our programs?

—Perhaps in courses on the history and structure of the language? These can include some attention to language development and to the psychological principles of language learning—although too often the linguists who teach such courses lack any basic understanding of the psychology themselves. And for secondary teachers, these courses in language are already so full that one cannot conceive of additional content being effectively introduced.

—Better, I think to consider ways of modifying traditional offerings in educational psychology, to make these courses more incisive and more clearly related to the classroom experience of the teacher. I will grant, for example, that certain principles of learning, child development, testing, and mental health probably need to be acquired by all teachers. I submit, however, that most of these possess meaning only when applied to the teaching and learning of subject matter. Many of the psychologists teaching introductory courses in educational psychology lack sufficient mastery of any single subject to draw the implications as they might. I suggest therefore that we experiment by reorganizing such courses to provide a team approach, perhaps by presenting to all students a weekly general lecture, followed by two hours of discussion of implications for language learning directed by a subject specialist. Prospective elementary teachers might meet for discussion in a separate section, perhaps led on one occasion by a specialist on language development, on another by one concerned with arithmetic, or some other subject area. Unless we can bridge the gap

83

between general principle and application to specific learning in our preparatory program, we will never achieve the results that we are seeking.

II. Let us face facts next about our lack of success in literature, admitting clearly that for the great mass of our teachers—despite the total number of semester hours and the percentage of time in methods courses devoted to this subject, we can have little confidence in the work done either with *intensive* or *extensive* reading. And, even as we welcome the many advantages of new critical, textual approaches which seem to offer students valuable tools of literary analysis and exploration, we need to remember that *depth* reading of *single works* will be successful *only* to the extent it is supported by strong, organized programs of individual reading. As that peerless literary scholar Helen C. White says in her magnificent review of *Changing Styles in Literary Studies*, "It is quite true that wide reading can often be aimless without critical direction and reflection, *but* it is no less true that critical reflection without wide reading can be a very sterile thing and even perverse." This admonition we need to consider carefully.

It takes little more than a day or two in any school in the country to recognize how singularly unsuccessful we have been in helping teachers to organize guided programs of individual reading. How much attention, I wonder, do we really give to this difficult problem in our methods work? How many of our students enroll at any time in any class, even at the university level, in which they learn by personal experience and example what a sound program of guided reading actually is? Why could we not, as methods instructors, accept responsibility for guiding wide reading in English methodology in such a way as to illustrate what might be done in the classroom? Or de we even know how? This it seems to me is a most neglected area, and strong programs of critical analysis can only be built on such a broad foundation.

But if we move from preparing teachers for directing the extensive reading of students to preparing them for directing the intensive study of a selection, our responsibilities become even heavier. To guide young people in analyzing the form, language, and unity of a literary work in all of its dimensions—its tone, irony, symbolic meanings, and language, its historical and biographical content, its ethical and moral intent—indeed its diverse and multiple meanings in all of their richness—a teacher must not only know literature in the sense of coverage, but also in terms of practical analysis. Programs which emphasize only surveys of English and American literature are therefore far from sufficient. Somehow, perhaps by advanced courses in practical or applied criticism, we must provide future teachers with the personal skills of analysis. But this by itself seems insufficient. Just as learning to write fails to prepare individuals for the teaching of writing, so learning to read literature is not sufficient preparation for the teaching of literature. If I were forced to choose between a broad survey of English and American literature and a sharp, carefully controlled, advanced course in applied criticism in which future teachers would receive carefully directed help, I would surely choose the critical, seminar approach. Probably we need to provide both.

During the past year I have been visiting classrooms throughout the country as part of the National Study of High School English Programs, and I am concerned increasingly about how few carefully planned lessons involving the analysis of literary texts I have actually found. No longer am I concerned lest the heavy stress on explication and related textual approaches now apparent in professional literature somehow will lead teachers far astray. No doubt the overpowering loads of many English teachers militate against the careful planning of lessons involving the intensive analysis of texts, just as such loads prevent the careful reading of student themes. But I have wondered how many teachers themselves have had directed and guided experiences in preparing teaching plans involving the analysis of literary works. I would suggest that part of the preprofessional experience of every high school and many elementary teachers be the planning of appropriate lessons involving the intensive analysis of a single work. Just as I think we must organize our work in methods to provide directed experiences in guiding individual reading, so I believe we must provide this other experience as well. For too long, I feel, we have trusted to chance alone. Let us remember that when we become over-worked, we fail to do the careful planning needed to analyze texts and fall back on talking about them.

III. Let us face the facts about imbalance in our programs. The deficiencies of students in language and composition—even at the time emphasized that these studies represented two-thirds of the trivium of our subject—has been so well documented publicly as not to require comment here. Fortunately, there is evidence, some of which I shall soon present, that our colleges are looking anew at their offerings for teachers in these areas.

But think, too, of those who for twenty-five years have proclaimed that our program rests upon the four language arts of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. It takes no extensive study of current school offerings to reveal that two of these four "arts"—listening and speaking—are virtually ignored in the overwhelming majority of elementary and secondary schools today, that during the last six years of our high school programs, reading itself receives precious little attention. Indeed, is it not even difficult to name a substantial number of high school teachers of English who are even willing to admit verbally that they share *any* responsibility for the teaching of reading, the teaching of speaking, the teaching of listening? Why? To some extent their present unwillingness may be related to current efforts to direct attention to the tripartite curriculum—language, literature, and composition—but more basically, I think, the explanation is to be found in the failure of our programs of English education to prepare teachers to face these responsibilities. We have been wont to expend untold energies on the identification of purposes and objectives in some of these areas, even to the development of large sections of language arts guides. But how much practical classroom help have we presented? What do you do about listening in your methods course? Look to the percentages of time revealed by the Evans study! Look also at the fragmentary attention given such topics in our methods books. Look then to the Council's recently concluded study of the continuing education of teachers: 90 percent of all secondary teachers saying

they are not well prepared to teach reading, 66 percent admitting they are not well prepared to teach the oral skills.

If the four language arts are as important in our programs in English as we have been saying for many years, then should not our practice in teacher education reflect this assessment?

And what of imbalance in the preparation of elementary teachers? Here the lag between preparation and practice is so great that one wonders why it has not been more widely discussed. How much of the instructional time of elementary teachers is spent on the language arts? 62.7 percent in grade one in Indiana, according to official figures from the Indana State Department of Education, tapering off to some 42.5 percent of the instructional time in grade six. Forty to 50 percent in most other school districts, according to all studies I have examined. The teaching of reading, spelling, and writing, and language skills requires at least that amount of time.

How much instructional time in English is included in the preservice programs of the average elementary teacher to prepare for this, the most important of his instructional responsibilities? *Eight* percent of the course credit, according to the new NCTE study that will be released next month. Eight percent! And this includes not only courses in English, but all courses in education related specifically to language development, children's literature, reading, and the language arts curriculum. *Eight* percent of the preparation to prepare for almost half of the teaching! No wonder we need a new English education for elementary teachers! Now I know that elementary teachers bear a fearsome responsibility to all subject areas and that their training must reflect this broad responsibility. I am not one who insists that every elementary teacher must develop a college major in English, especially at a time when too few English departments offer sufficient courses possessing direct value for the elementary teacher. But I will submit that the gap between 8 percent of preservice time and 40 or 50 percent of instruction time is one that must be closed. Indeed, I offer this as one of our major problems in English education.

IV. Finally, let us look to the facts of our present programs as they pertain to the quality of English teaching seen and experienced by our preservice teachers. Again and again as I talk with teacher education specialists throughout the country, I find them concerned about the lack of high quality supervision in student teaching assignments and about the lack of quality teaching even available for observation.

I do not accept the widespread belief that the first obligation of supervised teaching experiences is to emulate actual teaching conditions. Although I believe that young people must be prepared for the harsh realities of difficult teaching conditions and nearly impossible pupil loads, I think our first obligation in preservice programs is to quality and vision. The things which the novice can and will see in most schools—impossible pupil-teacher ratios, lunchroom and restroom supervision, sponsorship of cocurricular activities, out-of-class responsibilities—are not the elements of American education that we wish to replicate forever. Rather, I think young people need to learn how exciting

English teaching can be under the optimum conditions, conditions perhaps that some will never be fortunate to face but toward which they can always continue to work. Quality of experience, rather than quantity, seems to me first priority. If the future teacher has never been brought to the edge of his seat with excitement about learning English, if he indeed has never seen students so stimulated about the learning of language and literature, then how can we possibly expect him to invest his own teaching with any zest and enthusiasm? I am willing to sacrifice, if I must, a full day of humdrum apprentice teaching for an hour or two of experience with a superior teacher under carefully controlled experience. Moreover, contrary to practice in many schools, I say that this experience in English, whether at the elementary or secondary level, must extend over at least a semester, because achieving firm results in language learning requires at least that long. Even after sixteen weeks, it is sometimes difficult for a beginner to see results. How can we expect them only after six or eight?

One logical extension of my thinking here may be the directed internship. About this I have an open mind, providing that direction is carefully retained. More important, I believe, is establishing demonstration and teaching centers directly related to teacher education programs, to illustrate in action the best methods and content that the profession can devise. I am impressed with what George Hillocks' Demonstration Center at Euclid offers the profession—a chance to see in action much that we discuss in theory. Too few of our teachers today have had personal experience with great teachers of English under conditions that we would like. Too few of them apparently possess the imagination to visualize what English teaching can be at its best. And those of us who have written books on the subject or who teach courses on it somehow seem incapable of firing the majority of our future teachers with a vision of what such a program might be. What we need, I think, as an integral part of our programs of teacher education, are controlled school situations—demonstration schools if you like, which provide observation and demonstration experiences closely coordinated or planned, by those responsible for the teacher education programs. I submit that in many ways the decline of teacher education in this country may be traced to the decline during the late Thirties and early Forties of the use of the demonstration school *as an instrument of teacher education*—to the time when we took our student teachers into the field to fact "actual" not "unrealistic" conditions and when demonstration schools began to function as independent research and curriculum development centers, uninterested in the problems of teacher education, rather than as demonstration service centers related directly to the academic and educational programs on each campus. So difficult is finding such first-rate field experiences that I hear that Harold Shane's new experimental teacher education program at Indiana University feels it must send its teachers hundreds of miles to Chicago, to Michigan, to centers far, far from the campus.

At the University of Illinois, for example, we have a celebrated demonstration school which seems likely to have some of the same impact on future English instruction that it has already had on the mathematics. Professor McCrimmon whom you heard on Thursday, resigning from his chairmanship of the Division

of General Studies, has devoted three years of his professional career to the reorganization of curriculum and teaching in the school. But, except on a personal level, his work and that of the school bear no relationship to our programs for preparing teachers in the departments of English or education. No student teacher is placed in this school nor even sent there to observe a superior teacher in action. Moreover, the breakdown in communication is so bad that both the Demonstration School and the Department of English are this year offering independent summer institutes for English teachers, both have set up some summer scholarship aid for teachers, and both are so out of touch with one another that those of us in the Department of English even invited the staff of the Demonstration School institute program to enroll in our own courses.

Planned demonstration experiences, closely related to the program of teacher education, seem essential to me in providing some vision of what is best in English education. Until the day when a better quality of teaching is observable in almost every school, the planned demonstration seems to me the most reasonable answer. Would that such centers could also demonstrate the best in teaching and curricular practice for all teachers in a state. This is not to say that I ignore the importance of teaching beginners to survive—to teach five classes a day, to get by with inadequate teaching materials, to learn to become a portable teacher because one lacks a room of his own, to improvise for the slow learner, to discover short-cuts to theme correction and lesson planning because one must face 175 students daily—young teachers must be awakened to these problems. But if we are ever to achieve permanent reforms in these schools, teachers must learn what language and literature teaching may be under reasonable conditions, to have the experience of planning and conducting a discussion on language with the careful assistance of someone like James McCrimmon, to understand what organized guided reading programs can do for English, to translate into actual operation much of what we have for so long talked about in our programs. This, to me, is part of the new English education. Perhaps for too long we have assumed that these things can be taught as any liberal arts subject is taught. Perhaps some new concept of all preservice work in education which will at the same time control it and yet relate it to teaching practice, perhaps this offers the hope. Out of the new internships, out of the increasing responsibility that institutions are assuming for their teacher education graduates, out of this breakdown between college and classroom may come part of the answer. It is certain that our present practices have not achieved our basic aims.

A Final Thought

I close now not on a note of despair but rather on one of hope. I do think things are looking up.

Fifteen months ago at Allerton Park here in Illinois some eighty-five chairmen of major college and university English departments met for a three-day conference to consider their responsibilities to our total field. Not all of you liked the report which emerged from the conference, but few will deny that it represented a new high in the stated willingness of English chairmen to accept some measure of responsibility to the total profession of English teaching. And

I can say here, as I have not publicly before, that more than a little of the impact of this conference resulted from the highly favorable reaction by top English scholars to the intelligence, good sense, cultured, and articulate points of view expressed by such educationists as N. L. Gage, David Russell, Dwight Burton, and others at the meeting.

Last month, I wrote the chairmen who attended the Allerton Park meeting to ascertain what action, if any, had been taken in the teaching of English during the fourteen months since the meeting. The reports, far too lengthy to be discussed in detail, are highly encouraging. *In every case*, without exception, some effort had been made on the part of a department either to reorganize its preservice courses, to offer new courses for teachers, to provide conferences and services for the profession at large, to enter into new alliances with the education departments, or to engage in some other professional work beyond that of teaching conventional courses.

In 60 percent of the departments, the specialist in the teaching of English holds an appointment in English, whether joint or sole—a percentage incidentally closely approximating the departmental affiliations of those attending this conference last year. In 34 percent of the institutions, appointments are solely in education, the remaining 6 percent either not answering or not indicating that such specialists were available on the campus. More importantly, only three of the chairmen reported any recent or continuing friction or difficulty in relations between college education and English departments—a remarkable percentage in view of my memory of discussions at Allerton Park.

When asked about recent professional developments on their campuses, the chairmen were quick to respond. Clearly the emergence of new course offerings in advanced composition, modern language study, and the history of the language have received great attention. Other new courses include the study of literary texts for teachers, advanced composition for elementary teachers, reading in the secondary schools, literature in the high schools, and English as a second language. Complete program reevaluations are underway in about 15 percent of the institutions. Several have appointed departmental committees on teacher education; and two have taken over advising of English teachers for the first time.

Research projects in the teaching of English have been undertaken by about one-fifth. The preparation of films or kinescopes by two institutions, conferences and institutes for English teachers by more than half; a newsletter for state English teachers has been organized by one; a statewide coordinator of articulation with schools is now on the faculties of three institutions.

Two institutions say they are now taking over the field supervision of student teachers in English; and at least two others are trying to persuade the education department to permit both the supervision and the methods offering to be introduced in English.

It is clear, too, that graduate work in the teaching of English is being carefully considered, with at least 20 percent of the schools introducing M.A.T.E. programs or a special master's degree for teachers. Three chairmen refer to Ph.D. programs in the teaching of English which are currently under consideration—either in English departments or as jointly operated with education. One

program already underway allows 54 hours in English studies and 24 hours in psychology and education. Still other chairmen, reluctant to support a new Ph.D., see the need for some interim teaching degree beyond the present master's but short of the scholarly requirement for the Ph.D.

The questionnaires and letters are exciting to read. By no means do I agree with and support every idea being introduced. But the energy and enthusiasm with which these letters were written indicate more clearly than anything else the vitality of English education at the present moment.

Does the new English require a new English education? Most affirmatively so, and the pressures and leadership that will bring both the new English and the new English education are already in the profession. Out of the ferment, self-criticism, and replanning that is English today may come, must come, shall come an education for teachers worthy of the greatness and the excitement of our discipline. When it comes, as it comes, I expect this Conference to play an important role.

SUMMARIES OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

I. *What are the elements of a sound program in the language arts preparation of elementary school teachers?*

The group concerned with the language arts preparation of elementary teachers organized its discussion around two related questions: What proficiencies should elementary teachers have if they are to do a good job of teaching in the language arts program? What types of college programs will produce teachers with such proficiencies?

Specific recommendations concerning proficiencies necessary to successful elementary language arts instruction relate to the teacher's own abilities and skills as well as the ability to teach these skills. The teacher's personal competency in writing and speaking, as well as a deep awareness of and sensitivity to forms and values of literature, seems of prime importance to improved language arts instruction at the elementary level. Abilities in teaching the foundations of reading in a much shorter period of time than heretofore and teaching the more complex skills at earlier grade levels must be possessed by every elementary school teacher. (Specifically, the skills of word recognition and usage as well as the abilities to evaluate and appreciate need to be taught in the lower grades.)

To equip the elementary language arts teacher with these proficiencies, recommendations were made for additional work in the teaching of reading, mechanics of writing, and language study, as well as at least one quarter or one semester of clinical work with children who have problems in reading. Courses dealing with specific structure and content of literature were also suggested.

The recommendation that teachers need broader and deeper backgrounds implies an increase in the total amount of course work which the prospective elementary teacher should pursue. A fifth year of work seems advisable to the elementary discussion group, although only the general directions of the work and not specific recommendations were evident.

It was suggested that recent explorations of the connections between structural linguistics and the teaching of reading might provide new insights into the teaching of reading as well as into the study of literature and composition. Language study seemed to be the focus for many of the proficiencies necessary for the elementary language arts teacher.

II. *What constitutes the sound program for the continuing education of teachers? What kinds of graduate courses and research are appropriate? What are the comparative merits of MAT, Five- and Fifth-Year Programs? What are the characteristics of sound "inservice" programs?*

A successful program of continuing education, including inservice training, fosters impetus for change which comes from teachers who have become increasingly aware of new developments in methods of teaching, in research in principles of learning, and in increased knowledge of subject matter.

Subject matter for the English teacher engaged in study beyond his basic preparation should be of advanced or graduate level nature and could include work in the following areas: psychology of learning including adolescent psy-

chology and problems of learning; research including statistical analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of research; literature for adolescents; teaching of the major phases of English; methods of planning, teaching, and evaluating; methods of inquiry involving composition, language, literature; and the structure of the discipline with special emphasis on applied linguistics, characteristics of language, history and development of language, principles of composition, and creativity in composition.

The continuing education program should be carried out not only on the college campus, but through inservice workshops, department meetings, and visitation opportunities. Especially important for the new teacher is the opportunity of working under the guidance of a master teacher.

The group identified three areas of special concern: (1) A strong plea is made for programs that will provide teachers who must deal with the culturally deprived so that they are equipped with skills in combating and solving problems of literacy, and with specific methods that create a learning environment which is stimulating and rewarding to such youth. (2) Of more widespread concern is the necessity for channeling qualified people into education, contributing to the increasing prestige of teaching as a profession, putting teachers into positions for which they are best suited, allowing the public school to be used as a local teacher education center, and developing programs which allow for adequate supervision in teacher preparation programs. (3) Of special concern also is the continued and improved cooperation of the English education specialist and other academic personnel. The increased competency of people in the field of education in general may be important in eliciting respect of personnel in other fields.

III. *How can the methods course for beginning teachers be structured to accommodate current developments? What are the implications for such courses inherent in the variant curricula being developed by Commission on English of CEEB, Project English Centers, and others? What are the implications of programed materials for teacher education courses?*

The crucial problem facing the instructor of today's language arts methods course is the necessity of structuring a consistent philosophy of English instruction, a philosophy which will integrate the component parts of the language arts curriculum into a unified program. Not only does the need exist for eliminating fragmented, cafeteria-style methods courses in which short courses in remedial reading, journalism, speech, dramatics, radio and television are juxtaposed into an awkward potpourri but an accompanying need exists for fostering this consistent philosophy of instruction in prospective teachers and for developing practical means of applying its theory to actual teaching situations.

Two possible procedural solutions to the methods instructor's dilemma were proposed: (1) "*Models of Togetherness*"—student teams formed for observation experience to share ideas and to write cohesive units relating and moving from literature to language to composition to prepare students to teach English in units, and to learn to work with future staff members in curricular matters—present a possibility for building an integrated, unified course in methods.

(2) Involving prospective teachers in readings, discussions, and demonstrations of the four major areas of language arts activities which smoothly integrate reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Another major responsibility of the methods instructor is the careful screening of students planning to enter the teaching field through enrollment in the methods course. Potential English teachers should demonstrate ability in writing and should be able to teach fundamental skills and techniques of writing as well as the literatures of all continents and periods. Students with grade averages lower than C in the major field, who are inarticulate and ineffective in communication, have speech impediments, or are temperamentally unsuited for the classroom should be eliminated.

Specific responsibilities for the methods teacher include acquainting students with professional publications, state curriculum guides, and professional organizations; helping students recognize the wealth of materials available to alert teachers in newspapers, magazines, and other nonprofessional media; interpreting and evaluating recent research in the teaching of the language arts; developing an awareness of how and what to teach the terminal and the college preparatory student as well as the potential dropout.

Some consideration was given to the effectiveness of the CEEB Summer Institutes for classroom teachers in continuing the work of the methods course. Although the institutes were devised to present subject matter, theory, and immediate application, the chief criticism seems to be that a wide gap between theory and practice was left unbridged; little time was devoted to consideration of the pedagogical implications of the materials and ideas presented.

The use of programed materials as a teaching method was discussed. Despite the fact that few participants in the discussion had any experience with programed materials either as a teacher or an observer, the consensus was that a thorough study of such programs could have a wholesome effect on the teaching and testing processes.

IV. *What constitutes a sound undergraduate program for the student preparing to teach English? What is the relationship of general education to specialized education?*

A base of general education which provides a strong background in the major fields of human knowledge is of importance to the potential English teacher; however, the mechanics by which such a general education base is obtained must vary from institution to institution. Means of providing for this broad background include reading lists, seminars which encourage broad reading, and common foundation courses together with appropriate electives.

A combination of general education and specialized education, which should contribute to the self-integration of each potential teacher by revealing how English enters into life, should result in a broad variety of proficiencies and understandings.

Professional education courses should build upon the foundations provided by general and special education. Methods courses in particular should provide a focus for the means and ends of teaching through the introduction of theory.

Since general education should provide the undergraduate with an understanding of man's vision of the good life and his part in it, an understanding of what various visions mean and how these visions are related, and an understanding of how man's visions are seen, and since specialized education should contribute to the self-integration of each potential teacher revealing how English enters into life, the relationship between the two is perhaps best expressed as the tension between self (seeing how one's profession can contribute to society) and society.

V. *Should junior high teachers of English be prepared in a specialized program? What should such a program contain? Who should be responsible for such programs—elementary or secondary departments?*

Discussion of the problems of preparing teachers of English for the junior high school led to the observation that junior high teacher preparation programs have been uneconomical, repetitious, trivial, and lacking in unity. It was suggested that junior high school teacher preparation programs in English should be studied by the NCTE with a view toward defining particular problem areas different from teaching English at either the elementary or senior high school levels.

More specifically, thorough study should be made of the structure and ways by which literature, language, and composition can be approached which will aid the teacher in meeting the differing developmental levels of the pre-adolescent and adolescent student. In this respect attention should be given to those public school systems (such as that at Wilmette, Illinois) where the public school systems take an active part in the preparation of English teachers, and to Project English Studies such as those being conducted at Florida State University which are investigating how best to present and organize the "new" English in the junior high school.

What should be the academic background in literature, language, and composition for future teachers of English at the junior high school level? Should this background be as specialized in academic areas or broader in the area of psychology of learning than that of senior high teachers? Particularly recommended is additional work in problems of reading, in adolescent literature, and in problems of writing. Because the amount of subject matter in English is monumental in itself, and because any dilution of requirements in the English major is undesirable, it was felt that the "core" program is not the most efficient way by which to organize the English program.

Not only is the program for preparation of junior high English teachers in need of careful study; the attitude of prospective junior high teachers also needs guidance into professional lines. Too often teachers approach the junior high assignment as a training ground for teaching at the senior high school level. It is the responsibility of the methods teacher to aid in changing this attitude and to instill the realization that teaching at this level is as important and rewarding as teaching at any other level.

CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

University of Illinois
April 2–4, 1964

First General Session

Presiding: Stanley B. Kegler, University of Minnesota
Greetings: Alonzo Grace, University of Illinois
Address:
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
"English Education as Scholarly Discipline"

Second General Session

Symposium: Preparing Teachers to Teach New Concepts and Structures
Moderator: J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Speakers:
Dorothy Petitt, San Francisco State College
"Organic Form: The Primary Concept to Be Taught in Literature"
James McCrimmon, University of Illinois
"What Language Concepts Should We Teach to Future Teachers of English?"

Third General Session

Presiding: Robert W. Rogers, University of Illinois
Speaker: Donald K. Smith, University of Minnesota
"English, Speech, and the Language Arts: Disorder and Latter Day Sorrow"

Fourth General Session

Symposium: New Developments with Implications for English Education
Moderator: Richard S. Alm, University of Hawaii
Speakers:
John S. Simmons, Florida State University
"The Florida Project"
John R. Searles, University of Wisconsin, Madison
"The Wisconsin Project"
Richard Corbin, Hunter College High School
"Implications of *Research in Written Composition*"
G. Robert Carlsen, University of Iowa
The Distinguished [illegible]h Award—Criteria
Oscar M. Haugh, [illegible]ty of Kansas
Research Propos[illegible]e Research Foundation

Fifth General Session

Panel Discussion: An Evaluation of Volume V, Preparation of Teachers
Moderator: Sister Mary Sylvia, Mount St. Joseph College
Panel:
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
"A Report on Volume V: *The Education of Teachers of English*"
Henry Meckel, San Jose State College
Interrogators:
Stephen Dunning, Northwestern University
Robert Shafer, Teachers College, Columbia
James E. Miller, Jr., University of Chicago

Sixth General Session

Presiding: Robert F. Hogan, NCTE
Critical Review of Discussions:
George H. Henry, University of Delaware
"A Way of Preparing an English Teacher"
Lou LaBrant, Dillard University

98

Seventh General Session

Presiding: William H. Evans, University of Illinois
Speaker:
James R. Squire, Executive Secretary, NCTE
"Does the New English Demand a New English Education?"

Discussion Groups

I. *What are the elements of a sound program in the language arts preparation of elementary school teachers?*
Chairman: Naomi Chase, University of Minnesota
Associate Chairman: Julia Haven, U. S. Office of Education
Consultants: 1. Mrs. Martin Dean, Oak Park, Illinois, Elementary Schools
2. Walter Moore, University of Illinois
3. Mary Tingle, University of Georgia
Recorder: Thomas Bacig, University of Minnesota

II. *What constitutes the sound program for the continuing education of teachers? What kinds of graduate courses and research are appropriate? What are the comparative merits of MAT, Five- and Fifth-Year Programs? What are the characteristics of sound "inservice" programs?*

II-A
Chairman: Ingrid Strom, Indiana University
Consultants: Thelma McAndless, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti
Paul Scheid, Auburn University, recorder

II-B
Chairman: Victor Gimmestad, Illinois State University at Normal
Consultants: 1. Morris Finder, Western Washington State College
2. John R. Searles, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Recorder: William R. Martin, University of Minnesota

III. *How can the methods course for beginning teachers be structured to accommodate current developments? What are the implications for such courses inherent in the variant curricula being developed by Commission on English of CEEB, Project English Centers, and others? What are the implications of programed materials for teacher education courses?*

III-A
Chairman: David Stryker, University of Florida
Consultants: 1. G. Robert Carlsen, University of Iowa
2. Arno Jewett, U. S. Office of Education
3. Priscilla Tyler, University of Illinois
Recorder: Sister Mary Andre, St. Cloud, Minnesota, Diocesan Coordinator's Office

III-B
Chairman: Elizabeth Rusk, Michigan State University
Consultants: 1. John Erickson, Wayne State University
2. Rodger Kemp, University of Minnesota
Recorder: Gene J. Lohman, University of Minnesota

III-C
Chairman: Lizette VanGelder, University of Kentucky
Consultants: 1. Marie D. Bryan, University of Maryland
2. Arnold Lazarus, Purdue University
Recorder: Oscar Bouise, Xavier University of Louisiana

IV. *What constitutes a sound undergraduate program for the student preparing to teach English? What is the relationship of general education to specialized education?*

IV-A
Chairman: Oscar M. Haugh, University of Kansas

Consultants: 1. Duane Scribner, Moorhead State College
2. Virginia M. Burke, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee
3. William West, State University of New York, Cortland
4. George H. Henry, University of Delaware
Recorder: Paul Conner, University of Iowa

IV-B

Chairman: Graham S. Frear, St. Olaf College
Consultants: 1. Roy Ludtke, University of Colorado, Boulder
2. Donald Tuttle, U. S. Office of Education
Recorder: Grace Knaggs, Thomas A. DeVilbiss High School, Toledo, Ohio

V. ***Should junior high teachers of English be prepared in a specialized program? What should such a program contain? Who should be responsible for such programs—elementary or secondary departments?***
Chairman: Geneva Hanna, University of Texas
Associate Chairman: George Hillocks, Jr., Euclid Junior High School, Euclid, Ohio
Consultants: 1. Malcolm Evans, Wilmette Junior High School
2. Eldonna Everetts, University of Nebraska
3. Loren Grissom, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College
4. Geraldine LaRoeque, Stanford University
5. Maurice McGlassen, Indiana University
Recorder: William T. Ojala, Florida State University